DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 424 682 EA 029 461

TITLE	Non-School Hours: Mobilizing School and Community Resources. Hearing on Examining Certain Initiatives To Mobilize School and Community Resources To Provide Quality Programs To Address the Needs of Students during Non-School Hours, Including the Administration's Proposed Expansion of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program Designed To Provide Funds to School-Community Partnerships To Start Up or Expand After-School, Extended Learning Programs for Schoolage Children of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, United States Senate, One Hundred Fifth Congress, Second Session.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, DC. Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources.
REPORT NO	Senate-Hrg-105-468
ISBN	ISBN-0-16-056576-6
PUB DATE	1998-02-25
NOTE	80p.
AVAILABLE FROM	U.S. Government Printing Office, Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*After School Programs; At Risk Persons; Elementary Secondary Education; Hearings; *Intervention; *Outreach Programs; Program Descriptions; School Community Relationship; Youth Problems
IDENTIFIERS	Congress 105th

ABSTRACT

This hearing explored ways in which to meet children's and families' needs during nonschool hours. It examined the nature of those needs, the barriers that various segments of the community face, how the Federal Government can help build coordinated school and community networks, and how to make nonschool hours safe for children. Testimony was provided by Gerald Tirozzi, assistant secretary for elementary and secondary education, U.S. Department of Education; Shepherd Smith, president of Institute for Youth Development; Brad Luck, high school student and president of the Essex Vermont Teen Center; Sue Luck, associate executive director of the greater Burlington YMCA; Senator Patty Murray; Arthur Sheninger, principal of Hatchery Hill School; Linda Childears, president of Young Americans Bank; and Thomas Frazier, commissioner of the Baltimore police department. Some of the issues discussed include starting school later in the day, supporting communities' youth initiatives, liability issues, and other concerns. (RJM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

EA

S. HRG. 105–468

NON-SCHOOL HOURS: MOBILIZING SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY RESOURCES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 424 682

HEARING

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED FIFTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

EXAMINING CERTAIN INITIATIVES TO MOBILIZE SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY RESOURCES TO PROVIDE QUALITY PROGRAMS TO ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF STUDENTS DURING NON-SCHOOL HOURS, INCLUDING THE ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSED EXPANSION OF THE 21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS PROGRAM DESIGNED TO PROVIDE FUNDS TO SCHOOL-COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS TO START UP OR EXPAND AFTER-SCHOOL, EXTENDED LEARNING PROGRAMS FOR SCHOOLAGE CHILDREN

FEBRUARY 25, 1998

Printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
46–811 CC WASHINGTON : 1998

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402
ISBN 0-16-056576-6

EA 029 461

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont, *Chairman*

DAN COATS, Indiana
JUDD GREGG, New Hampshire
BILL FRIST, Tennessee
MIKE DeWINE, Ohio
MICHAEL B. ENZI, Wyoming
TIM HUTCHINSON, Arkansas
SUSAN M. COLLINS, Maine
JOHN W. WARNER, Virginia
MITCH McCONNELL, Kentucky

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
TOM HARKIN, Iowa
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, Maryland
JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico
PAUL D. WELLSTONE, Minnesota
PATTY MURRAY, Washington
JACK REED, Rhode Island

MARK E. POWDEN, *Staff Director*
SUSAN K. HATTAN, *Deputy Staff Director*
WILLIAM G. DAUSTER, *Minority Chief of Staff and Chief Counsel*

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1998

	Page
Jeffords, Hon. James M., Chairman, Committee on Labor and Human Resources, opening statement	1
Kennedy, Hon. Edward M., a U.S. Senator from the State of Massachusetts, prepared statement	3
Leahy, Hon. Patrick J., a U.S. Senator from the State of Vermont, prepared statement	3
Tirozzi, Gerald N., Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC, accompanied by Ricky Takai, Assistant Secretary, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, and Susan Wilhelm, staff	4
Prepared statement	7
Smith, Shepherd, president, Institute for Youth Development, Washington, DC; Brad Luck, high school student and president of the Essex Teen Center, Essex, Vt; and Sue Luck, associate executive director, Greater Burlington YMCA, Burlington, VT	23
Prepared statements of:	
Mr. Smith	24
Mr. Luck	30
Ms. Luck	37
Murray, Hon. Patty, a U.S. Senator from the State of Washington, prepared statement	46
Sheninger, Arthur W., principal, Hatchery Hill School, Hackettstown, NJ, on behalf of the National Association of Elementary School Principals; Linda Childears, president, Young Americans Bank, Denver, CO, and president, board of directors, National Assembly of National Voluntary Health and Social Welfare Organizations; and Thomas C. Frazier, commissioner, Baltimore City Policy Department, Baltimore, MD, on behalf of Fight Crime: Invest in Kids	48
Prepared statements:	
Mr. Sheninger	51
Ms. Childears	56
Mr. Frazier	61
Volunteers of America, prepared statement	70

NON-SCHOOL HOURS: MOBILIZING SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY RESOURCES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1998

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:35 a.m., in room SD–430, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator Jeffords (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Senators Jeffords, Gregg, Wellstone, and Murray.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR JEFFORDS

The CHAIRMAN. This hearing of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources will come to order.

I want to welcome everyone to this hearing to explore the child care needs of school-age children and their families. The nonschool hours are more than just before and after the school day. They also include weekends, school vacation days, parent-teacher conference days, summer vacations, early release days—all of a child's waking hours when they are neither at school nor at home with their parents.

Most of us look back on our childhood and see our time consumed with school. In reality, of course, there are more nonschool than school hours in a child's life. With increasing numbers of parents working, there is a growing need to ensure a supervised, enriching environment for children when they are not in school. Yet far too often, that simple goal is out of reach for many children and parents.

President Clinton announced his child care initiative in January. The part that struck a chord with most parents was the need for after-school care. Parents and children need choices. They need an array of constructive, appealing activities for school-age children during nonschool hours.

After-school care provides a safe, supervised environment for school-age children during the hours when they cannot be with their parents or in school. High-quality after-school programs provide activities that foster positive youth development. Numerous studies tell us that the hours between the time that school ends and parents get home is a time of great risk for our children. Those hours have the highest levels of substance abuse, teenage sexual activity, delinquency, and other high-risk behaviors.

It is obvious that meeting the needs of children, youth and their families during nonschool hours may be the best "prevention" program. That is a lot of bang for the buck.

The Washington Metropolitan Area has the highest proportion of working women in this country. There are many community resources—parks and recreational centers, private businesses offering dancing, computer education, martial arts, swimming, art, and almost anything else you can imagine, school-based before- and after-school programs, a vast array of private voluntary organizations like the YMCA, Boys and Girls Clubs, Camp Fire, and others. But the reality is that these resources do not provide the support that our children need because they are operating in totally separate orbits.

Conversely, in rural areas like Vermont, there are few resources in either the public or the private sectors, huge transportation problems, and smaller populations from which to solicit local contributions in support of community programs. With smaller numbers of children and youth to participate in programs, the array of activities that can be made available becomes severely limited. Yet the need to have activities that actively engage each child is still a critical component of any successful after-school program.

In both resource-rich urban and suburban areas, and rural areas with limited resources, there is a notable lack of a cohesive network of programs and services for school-age children. This fragmented set of options presents its own difficulties. Rather like a thousand-piece jigsaw puzzle, it requires time, ingenuity and persistence to make it all fit together.

The situation becomes even worse if many of the pieces are missing, so often the case in rural and inner-city areas, or if parents cannot afford to buy the puzzle in the first place. These obstacles are even greater for low-income families, parents without understanding bosses, children whose parents work two or three jobs or shift work, parents with limited English-speaking skills, and single-parent families.

During this hearing, I want to explore ways in which we can better meet the needs of children and their families during these critical nonschool hours. What are those needs? What are the barriers to having the various segments of the community work in a more cohesive way to provide the support that these children need? How can the Federal Government help build the coordinated school and community networks that families need? Can we make the nonschool hours not only a safe time for kids, but a time that fosters positive growth and development of youth and inhibits the onset of risky behaviors?

I believe the witnesses that we are privileged to have with us today will help us begin to put the pieces of this puzzle together. I am pleased that we have so many different perspectives represented here today.

Senator Kennedy wanted to be here, but because of the funeral for Senator Ribicoff, he is unable to attend the hearing today. His statement will be included in the record as if read, as well as a statement from Senator Leahy.

[The prepared statements of Senators Kennedy and Leahy follow:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR KENNEDY

I commend Senator Jeffords for scheduling this hearing on the importance of making quality after-school care available to America's school-aged children. I hope that the result of these hearings will be prompt action by this Congress to meet this high priority.

Constituents, education and welfare agencies, law enforcement officers, and children's advocates are unanimous in their view that greater opportunities are needed for activities to keep school-age children off the streets, out of trouble and away from drugs. Over five million school-aged children are left home alone after school. Parents try to arrange care for their school-aged children, but are frequently prevented from doing so because of the location, cost, or the poor quality of the activities that are available. Often, no activities at all are available. Current Federal programs support after-school care for only I out of every to eligible children. Hundreds of thousands of families are on waiting lists for such care. The cost of not making after-school care available to working families is enormous. Children miss out on the opportunity to improve their learning and social skills. Those who turn to crime or drugs impose heavy costs on the community. Police across the nation report that delinquent conduct peaks between 3 and 8 p.m. each school day.

We know how to address these concerns. Part of the solution, as Senator Jeffords has proposed, is to support school-based after-school programs. His 21st Century Community Learning Center Program deserves to be expanded. In fact, President Clinton proposed to expand it five-fold from $40 million to $200 million annually. But even after that expansion, the program will be able to accommodate at most only 500,000 children from middle-income and low-income families. School-based programs cannot be relied upon entirely to meet this need. Further investments in community-based programs are essential.

State and local governments should have the flexibility to provide the care they find is necessary to meet community needs. The Child Care Development Block Grant should be expanded for this purpose, and I intend to introduce legislation to do so. Part of the increase should be earmarked to improve the quality of these activities, in response to extensive and compelling evidence that we know how to improve quality but have failed to do so. Clearly, all parents with school age children will benefit from these investments and I hope that a bipartisan consensus will emerge on the most effective ways to achieve this important goal.

Again, I commend Senator Jeffords for scheduling this hearing, and I look forward to the testimony of the witnesses.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR PATRICK LEAHY, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF VERMONT

I applaud my colleague from Vermont, Senator Jeffords, for convening this important hearing today to examine the growing need for after-school programs for children of all ages. With more and more parents of school-aged children working outside the home, we, as a nation, must make a commitment to our children to ensure they have safe and supervised places to be after school, on weekends and during vacations. I am looking forward to working on a bipartisan basis with Senator Jeffords and others to seek balanced and adequate funding for a variety of prevention programs in both 5.10—the juvenile crime bill—and in any future child care legislation.

THE NEED TO SUPPORT PREVENTION

Teenagers themselves are clamoring for programs to help them develop their job skills ad educational talents and places where they can have fun in a safe environment. Just last week I had the good fortune to meet Brad Luck, who will testify here today, at the Essex Teen Center in Vermont. Brad and several other students spearheaded the effort to establish a new teen center in Essex Junction and now serves as president of the student board of directors. During my visit with Attorney General Reno to the center last week, we learned that these students led the fund raising effort and raised more than $30,000 in one month to establish the center. They have continued to oversee its activities and have proven the importance of having kids involved and invested in prevention activities. America's teens are sending us a clear message: They want safe places for constructive after school activities.

The Essex Teen Center is just one of several new and creative prevention programs targeting teens in Vermont. In Burlington, the King Street Youth Center houses a new "Youth Entrepreneurial Seminar" for at-risk youths to teach them how to establish their own businesses. One of the Ley components of the YES program is matching these teens with local business leaders to learn the tricks and pitfalls of running one's own business. The teens in Woodstock have also established a teen center, using Essex Junction's facility as a model. And several towns in Vermont are exploring options for creating community-based restorative justice programs for juveniles which involve the perpetrator and victim in the resolution of delinquent acts.

Vermont also has many well-established programs for children and youth, including the YMCA's after-school program in Burlington. We are fortunate to have Sue Luck, Brad's mother and the Associate Executive Director of the YMCA, here today to discuss the varied programs offered by the Y, which is the largest provider of after-school programs in Vermont—and across the Nation. Vermont also has the good fortune to have a Boys and Girls Club in Burlington, two Big Brother/Big Sister mentoring programs in Bennington and Brattleboro, and a Youthbuild project, which teaches teens how to build homes while they rebuild their lives. Despite the commitment Vermonters have made to their children, I have heard again and again that more needs to be done. I intend to do all I can to ensure that any bill which passes the Senate supports the broad array of prevention programs currently in place in Vermont. Local communities, not the Federal Government, should decide specifically how any new Federal funds are spent.

The CHAIRMAN. Our first witness is Dr. Gerald Tirozzi. Dr. Tirozzi is the assistant secretary of elementary and secondary education at the United States Department of Education. He was appointed to his current position in January, 1996. Dr. Tirozzi has extensive experience in the field of education, from high school science teacher to college president to State commissioner of education in Connecticut. Dr. Tirozzi has distinguished himself as a nationally-recognized leader in education reform.

Thank you for being with us today, and please proceed, Dr. Tirozzi.

STATEMENT OF GERALD N. TIROZZI, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, WASHINGTON, DC; ACCOMPANIED BY RICKY TAKAI, ASSISTANT SECRETARY, OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT, AND SUSAN WILHELM, STAFF

Mr. TIROZZI. Thank you, Senator Jeffords. It is a pleasure to have this opportunity to speak to the committee and to talk about this particular subject.

I also want to commend you personally for your commitment and your assistance in seeing this program get started. I really appreciated your opening remarks, because in many respects, they take the place of some of my opening remarks, which is fine. I think you did a super job with that.

Just for the record—and you have a copy of my full testimony—I am simply going to try to summarize the key points and then give you an opportunity to ask questions.

I have been in public education for approximately 38 years, and I was a community school principal in the 1960's and operated a school that was opening from 8 in the morning until 10 in the evening, weekends and summers, and had a plethora of services, including health, education, social services, dentistry, and so on, and it was really a wonderful experience at that time. Later, I had the opportunity—and I will mention the Mott Foundation in just a few moments further—I had the pleasure of being a Mott Fellow at Michigan State University where my Ph.D. was not only in educational administration but had a focus on community education. So I come before as a person who not only is committed to this program, but I would like to go so far as to say very definitely viscerally committed to the concept of extending the school day, the school week, the school year.

I also want to introduce my colleague, Ricky Takai. Ricky is the acting assistant secretary of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement. The program at the moment resides on that side of our organization, and Ricky is here to answer some questions as well.

Again, you stated very well in your opening remarks the need, you gave the background and some of the statistics. We are concerned very much that only approximately 1.7 million children in kindergarten through grade 8 are enrolled in formal after-school programs, and in particular we are concerned than less than 4 percent of our total student body in public education is enrolled in after-school programs within the public schools. And of course, there is the issue in this country of latchkey children, children growing up alone, and as you said so well, the after-school hours between roughly 2 and 6, the FBI statistics clearly point out, are the time when we have the most problems in our country with violence, vandalism and so on.

Also—and some people do not know this—but it has been reported by phone companies that the busiest time of day for them is roughly between 3 and 3:30 in the afternoon, when parents are calling home to see if Johnny and Mary are safe. So I think the potential to extend this program is just so absolutely on target and is something we truly applaud.

I need to step back and say that if we are going to accept the fact that schooling only takes place between the hours of approximately 8:30 and 2:30, we have made a tragic mistake as a Nation. The potential to extend the day, the week and the year makes consummate sense.

I also think it makes real sense to strongly consider the program having a major focus within the public schools. And of course, in our proposal, we ask that 10 percent of the money be set aside for community-based organizations. We want to work very closely and cooperatively with community-based organizations. We have a long history of doing that. But in particular, if we are going to see the program as really an extension of schooling, especially the educational arm of the program, I think we have got to look for that inextricable link between the schoolhouse and the after school, and

wherever we do not have the facilities, then, of course, we do have to look to the community for other kinds of resources.

Also, I want to point out in terms of wanting to be efficient and effective, cost-efficient in particular, if you consider the reality that in this country, the greatest investment that taxpayers have at the local level is really in facilities, the capital investment in schools. It is a multibillion-dollar investment. If you look around at how corporations operate, they would never close their main facilities down at 2:30 every day, and we do that.

So to use the schools makes real sense to me, and to look at the facilities they have makes real sense. To attempt to start other programs that duplicate the facilities makes little sense. And also, to try to have the program inextricably linked to what is taking place in the schools makes sense.

We are also concerned that historically, many of the programs after school have not necessarily been quality programs. They have really been programs of supervised care, if you will. We very much want to see these programs build on educational initiatives. We want to link it to reading, to math, to technology, to science, to college preparation.

Just quickly, Senator Kennedy has offered a number of programs—the High Hopes Program, where mentors can come in and work after school with students; America Reads has tremendous potential to use the schoolhouse with tutors and reading teachers, and I could go on with a plethora of other types of programs.

We are also very pleased that the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation has made a significant commitment of approximately $55 million over the next several years to provide national technical assistance to States and local school districts in trying to implement quality programs across this country. And the Mott Foundation, of course, has been involved in community education since probably the 1930's, so they have a longstanding commitment to this issue.

I also want very much to note that when we look at the request for $200 million for next year, we are very optimistic that that will, of course, dramatically expand the number of centers we would be operating, and we could accommodate approximately 500,000 children per year, with centers providing matching funds.

I also want to note that the commitment we are trying to make in matching funds I think is very important. Based on my own experience in community education, it seems when the Federal dollars disappear, often these programs disappear. So we are suggesting that this grant be expanded to a 5-year grant, with our costs really going up for 3 years and then coming down, really giving districts 5 years to figure out how they are going to phase it in, because my concern is that if we do not consider that type of reality, then over time, the program may very well disappear.

So in closing my brief remarks, I would like to say that I think without question, this is something that we should do as a Nation. I think we have to utilize our school facilities to the maximum. I think we have to provide students and their parents with high-quality programs that to the extent possible should be linked to the traditional school day so we do not have disparate activities taking place in our schools. I think the potential exists for programs that often right now do not fit into a school curriculum, for myriad rea-

sons, like art and music and science and technology, to be incorporated.

Based on all the polls we are seeing, parents fully support the use of public schools for these reasons. The elementary principals' association several years ago did a survey of principals, and almost 90 percent support this kind of program. Teachers are on board as saying this program is very important. But first and foremost, parents have really sent a loud and clear message that schools really should be a safe haven for children in these after-school hours.

So the initiative is timely, the initiative is appropriate. Going to $200 million, we think is on target over 5 years, reaching approximately $1 billion, and really would move us in the direction of maximizing the use of our schools and meeting the diverse needs of our students and our communities.

I am going to stop there, because I really want to give you time for questions. I hope you get a sense that Secretary Riley and we at the Department are totally committed to this effort. And again, Senator Jeffords, we want to commend you for your leadership in getting this started.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Tirozzi follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF GERALD TIROZZI

Good morning, Senator Jeffords, and members of the committee. It is a pleasure to be invited to speak with you today on a subject that is dear to the heart of those of us who have served our nation's public schools, as I have over the last 38 years. Children ad youth need a safe ad enriching environment to learn and grow in their after-school hours. But they can thrive in community learning centers where learning, enrichment, and recreational activities complement, link with, and build on their regular school day.

It seems like such a simple concept, but for any of us who are or hope to be parents, we know this is a issue of extreme urgency. There are not enough after-school and summer programs to serve our school-age kids. Bringing quality programs to every community is a very high priority for American families.

My boss, Education Secretary Riley, understands this. He believes that quality after-school programs are a essential component of a strong school—a strong community. The school-community partnerships that are included in any after school program are good for building better schools and better neighborhoods . . . and that builds a better America.

That is why President Clinton has proposed a historic and comprehensive $21 billion child-care initiative. One part of this proposal includes a dramatic expansion of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program to provide funds to school-community partnerships to start up or expand after-school, extended learning programs for school-age children.

The program will increase the supply of high-quality extended-learning programming in a cost-effective manner, primarily by funding programs that use public schools and their existing infrastructure and by building partnerships with community-based and youth organizations. Community-based organizations can bring to an after-school program their youth development experience. Community coalitions will have the flexibility to decide, with the school, what their extended learning priorities are—before-school programming, after-school learning opportunities, weekend activities, or summer enrichment programs.

Our communities are hungry for these types of after-school partnerships. With generous support from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, which has pledged up to $55 million to provide technical assistance for the multi-year expansion of 21st Century Community Learning Centers, 11 regional technical assistance workshops were held earlier this month across our country to provide information to potential applicants about how to run a high quality program and compete for grants. Attendance at these workshops was overwhelming.

From Seattle and Los Angeles, to St. Louis and Dallas, to Boston and Atlanta, more than 5,000 community representatives from families, schools, community and civic organizations, local governments, foundations, religious faiths, and businesses came together to find out what quality, extended learning programming is, how to

collaborate, and what are some models of best practice. In three short months, in addition to the 16,000 application packages we sent out to every school district in the country, we have fulfilled 15,000 additional requests for applications. Many, many more have been down-loaded off the Internet.

Why is there such a outpouring of interest? While there has been a growth in the availability of after-school care programs for children over the last 20 years, relatively few organized, extended learning opportunities exist when compared to need. Let me share with you what we know about who participates in after-school programs and the overwhelming need to keep our young people productively involved in the after-school hours.

In 1991, there were 35.9 million children between the ages of 5 and 14 living in the United States. Approximately 24 million of these school-age children needed child care because of working parents or parents seeking employment. However, only about 1.7 million children from kindergarten through grade 8 were enrolled in 49,500 formal before- and after-school programs.

Extended learning programs in schools are even more scarce, especially for older children and youth.

- According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), in 1993–94, only 974,348 children in public elementary schools (just 3.4 percent of students in public elementary schools) were enrolled in 18,111 before- or after-school programs at public schools.
- Seventy percent of all public elementary and combined schools did not offer before- or after-school programs.

Experts estimate that about 5 million school-age children spend time without adult supervision, as "latch-key" children, during a typical week. Because of self-reporting, however, it is difficult to get a firm figure.

The Administration's proposed expansion of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program will bring much-needed attention to the provision of supplementary learning activities in interesting and engaging ways, with activities addressing the needs of young adolescents and the problems of drug use, gang involvement, and violence.

According to the America Academy of Pediatrics, recent studies show that adolescents who are unsupervised after school are more likely to use alcohol and other drugs. Studies by the FBI and youth-advocacy groups have found that the peak hours for juvenile crime and victimization are from 3 pm. to 8 pm.—hours when youth are most often without supervision.

Community learning centers can provide a safe haven for youth, supervised activities, and services focusing on learning enhancement as well as on preventing crime, violence, and substance abuse.

By locating 21st Century Community Learning Centers within schools we can ensure that students receive educational services directly linked to their classroom needs. Centers can enlace educational opportunities in numerous ways that address what mainstream America wants in better schools.

Centers can offer tutoring to help students master basic skills. Centers can provide middle school students with more opportunities to do hands-on math and science, as well as homework help in these key subjects which are gateway courses to college—and good careers.

After-school is a excellent time to help middle school kids see the possibilities of going to college. Centers can provide mentoring by caring adults and college students to encourage students to set higher academic and career goals. College visits, mentoring, and learning about preparing for college, academically and financially, must start in middle schools if all students, especially low-income and disadvantaged students, have a realistic chance to go to college—because college is what gives all kids a shot at the America Dream.

Centers can provide opportunities for children to learn to use technology. Centers can also make core subjects more relevant and exciting by linking up with local museums, libraries, youth groups, businesses, universities, art centers, and other educational or career-related activities. Many low-income children don't have access to computers at home. Keeping schools open can help them gain access to this essential learning resource.

Centers can provide enrichment opportunities in art, drama, and music which unfortunately are often the last courses funded during the regular school day. Centers can serve as a base for community service and service-learning opportunities. In fact, many before- and after-school programs operate with the help of AmeriCorps volunteers who mentor, tutor, and work with children.

Survey data clearly indicate the demand for after-school programs. A 1997 survey of both elementary and middle school parents shows that 90 percent of parents want after-school programs.

This same survey asked parents what kind of activities they would like their children to be involved in and found that:

- 95 percent of parents felt their child would benefit from a program that included technology classes.
- 91 percent of parents felt their child would benefit from arts, music, and cultural activities.
- Among parents of middle school students, 90 percent favored after-school community service or volunteer opportunities for their children.

By and large, the public favors keeping school buildings open for use by school children with adult supervision: 87 percent favored keeping schools open after school; 67 percent favored keeping schools open on weekends; and 72 percent favored keeping schools open during vacations.

Principals have long seen a need for extended learning programs; in a 1989 survey, 84 percent of school principals agreed that there is a need for before- and after-school programs. In 1993, the National Association of Elementary Principals printed a book for their membership on quality standards for after-school programs.

Last summer, the Secretary of Education ad the First Lady released a guidebook under the auspices of the Partnership for Family Involvement in Education on implementing school-based after-school programs. The Partnership, a 4,000 member coalition comprised of organizations representing families, schools, communities, religious institutions, and employers, was founded by Secretary Riley in 1994. The Partnership seeks to provide parents and local communities with the information they need to improve schools and help children learn more.

Keeping Schools Open as Community Learning Centers: Extending Learning in a Safe, Drug-free Environment Before and After School is a step-by-step guidebook for families and community members to work with the local schools to implement a safe extended-learning program. The guidebook has been a "best seller" for the Department. So much so, that we included this useful information in the 21st Century Community Learning Center application package.

With all of this strong parental and public support for after-school programs, you might be asking what the effects of after-school programs are on learning. Research shows that students in quality after-school programs demonstrate higher academic achievement and have better attitudes toward school than children left alone or under the care of siblings.

Participation in extended learning programs can be particularly beneficial to disadvantaged or low-achieving students. Children from low-income families often lack the resources that more affluent families can spend on improving the quality of their children's education, both in and out of school. Parents who are moving off welfare and into the workforce are a major source of the demand for high-quality academic programs after school.

For all these reasons and more, the Administration is requesting, in its Fiscal Year 1999 budget before Congress, $200 million for Community Learning Centers, and a total of $1 billion over 5 years, which will fund competitive grants to approximately 4,000 centers, including continuation grants to the centers funded in 1998.

If Congress supports expanding the program from its current $40 million in 1998 to $200 million in 1999, it will provide extended-hour school services for approximately 500,000 children per year, with a local 1 to 1 match.

Vice President Gore was absolutely on the mark when he said at a recent press conference on the proposed 21St Century Community Learning Centers expansion, "This period of time between the school bell and the factory whistle is a most vulnerable time for children. These are the hours when children are more likely to engage in at-risk behavior and are more vulnerable to the dangers that still exist in too many neighborhoods and communities."

So what will it take to make families feel secure in the knowledge that their children are not only safe, but filled with the wonder and excitement of learning? As Secretary Riley said last week in his State of American Education speech in Seattle, "This is an extraordinary and demanding time for our nation's schools and I ask all Americans to pitch in."

By providing safe and enriching high-quality after-school programs, like those available through the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program, we can all "pitch in" for our kids.

Let me again thank you for holding these hearings on the importance of high-quality before- and after-school programs.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, thank you. First, I am going to pick on you a little bit.

Mr. TIROZZI. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The law that you chose to utilize for the grant program is one which I introduced in the 94th Congress, and was signed into law. But it had a broader focus and a different focus in a sense, which was to use the schools as community centers and to bring in resources and to help adults, parents, and others to work together.

I am a little concerned to see the way that you have implemented the grants. First of all, it is a little curious that you recommended zero funding and then, all of a sudden you requested $50 million, and now it is $200 million, which should make me excited. But then I read the grant programs, and they do not follow the legislation. They do a worthy thing, but it is not consistent with the intent of the legislation. I am concerned that already, with the rules that went out in December, 1987, it shifted entirely the emphasis to one specific activity. Without our knowledge or even letting us know that you intended to make it a single rifle shot you changed the program by cleverly saying you can ask for anything that the bill does, but we will only give you a grant if you use it for after school care.

That is the kind of use of regulations that I think irritates Congress when, even though the goal is very worthy, we find that a law that was intended to do many things is narrowed down to one focus.

I was so pleased to see the increased appropriation request last year where previously you had not requested any funding. I was even more happy to see the big number this year; but then I find that it is designed to do something which was part of the bill but only one of 13 uses for the grant funds. Anybody who tries to receive a grant similar to what was intended under the legislation really does not have a chance to get a grant under this years rules.

I would like your comments on that.

Mr. TIROZZI. I just want to be clear. Your concern is that we are focusing the bill more on children than the broad community?

The CHAIRMAN. Well, your grant request says you can do anything the statute tells you to; however, the only thing we are going to grant money for is after school care, basically. So all the other activities which were authorized under the statute do not have a chance to get any money. Now, after-school care is such a laudable cause, which we all applaud. However, it is a little irritating to the person who purposely crafted the law to have a broader range of activities to find out, by fiat of the administration, you are saying yes, you can ask for it, but we are only going to give it to you for this one program. How did you come to that conclusion?

Mr. TIROZZI. I think the key—and again, I was not privy to some earlier conversations that people might have had with your staff—I think that what this attempts to do is to build on that legislation and try to really emphasize the fact that the after-school hours in particular can enhance the life of a community, its citizens and its children.

We put a focus on children because, in fairness, in your comments, in my comments and what the evaluations are telling us, there is a tremendous need to serve the needs of youngsters after school.

I do not think we are in any way trying to move aside a community. My own experience in the community school program is that when you really emphasize and work with children, you have a much greater potential to involve their parents and to involve the community. It becomes almost a captive audience kind of situation.

There are so many diverse and important ways we can involve the community and involve parents by working directly with children. I just think that emphasizing the after-school hours made consummate sense as we had this discussion, as we talk with the Justice Department, and we hear some of these startling statistics on after-school crime, if you look at the situation of latchkey children in this country, if you look at the lack of quality child care and day care in this country.

I always like to go back to the premise that schools should be seen as a real safe haven within the community, and I think for all of those reasons, that is how the decision was made.

Ricky, do you have any further knowledge of that?

Mr. TAKAI. Well, it is true that there is sort of an absolute priority for this competition for expanding learning opportunities for children. But in addition to that, applicants are required to include at least 4 of the 13 statutory activities that are listed in the bill. So that in addition to providing expanded learning opportunities, they can pick any 4 of those 13 that are listed in the statute.

So it is beyond simply the notion of expanded learning opportunities.

The CHAIRMAN. I will be curious to see what you actually award under these grants. Have there been grants awarded?

Mr. TAKAI. There have only been seven grants that were awarded, I believe in 1995. The 1996 money was simply used for the continuation of those grants. And those grants do include a wide range of activities, including day care, employment and training kinds of activities that are listed in the statute. So it does go way beyond simply providing——

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I would like to see copies of those grants that were awarded.

Mr. TAKAI. OK.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not want to get off the focus here today, but I want to send a strong message that I am irritated by the kind of fiat that the administration took with the 21st Century Community Learning Centers legislation. The Department is saying that this is wonderful. Community schools will stay open at after-school and try to get the children and adults working together with parents, and all those nice activities that help a community. You all know that getting parents involved is probably one of the most important things we can do. It is very difficult to do by limiting this legislation to after-school care rather than the broad ranges of services contained in the legislation. So I am irritated. Since it is for a good cause, I will back off now, but I hope you understand my concerns.

Mr. TIROZZI. Yes, I can, sir, but just for your edification, we have been working cooperatively with the National Community School Education Association, and they are fully supportive of the concept of what we are trying to do. And just a footnote, I had the pleasure of being a charter member of that group in the 1960's, and right

now, it is the major vehicle in this country promoting broad, quality, community education, and in our discussions with them, we have talked about the broad range of activities, including adults and community and so on.

The CHAIRMAN. I believe the area that we should emphasize with the 21st Century Community Learning Centers should be activities designed to make maximum use of our school facilities. I would like to skip around a bit and discuss things we can do to eliminate social promotion. Earlier this week the President, in his discussion with Governors, announced that Secretary Riley would be issuing guidelines on social promotion. Could you share with us more details on this and also any thoughts as to how the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program could be part of the solution to this issue?

Mr. TIROZZI. Well, both the President and the Secretary on a number of occasions have spoken out on the issue of social promotion, being very concerned that in America we have a significant number of youngsters, especially in our poorer districts, who seem to move from grade to grade without necessarily demonstrating the necessary skills to move forward.

Now, I do want to say—and this is how I am attempting to answer your question—that one of the real problems in this country with what we call retention is that when you retain a student in the same type of program that he or she failed, you are not doing much of a service. You really have got to try to dramatically alter the program or provide other intervention strategies to help the student.

Where I think this program, expanding the 21st century model, the community school, can make a difference—I think that the extended day can provide for tutoring assistance for youngsters, it can build on what America Reads is talking about, it can allow more and diverse use of technology. The potential is there in the summer to run quality summer school programs for youngsters who are in danger of retention. Chicago, for example, has done a very good job with their quote-unquote social promotion program by requiring students to attend summer schools. One of the problems for schools is that unless they have the resources, they cannot necessarily keep the schools open in the summer. I think a grant like this could help in a number of ways.

I also think it could serve a real purpose in terms of helping parents with literacy. We have a significant number of parents in this country who themselves do not have good reading or math skills, and through a quality community school program, tying it in with adult literacy, we can help parents become better readers and in turn, hopefully, that will help their children in the home.

I personally think that one of the main reasons this program has been moved forward so rapidly and with an emphasis on children is trying to tie it very closely to the President's concern and the Secretary's concern with the issue of social promotion in America, using this as one vehicle to try to help.

The CHAIRMAN. Again to get back to the law, the 1994 law states that rural or inner-city public elementary, middle or secondary schools or consortia schools are eligible for funding. In the grant applications, I notice that LEA, the local education agency, has

been added; that is not in the statute. The intent of this legislation was to have very little bureaucracy and to get the Federal dollars directly to the schools. Why was the LEA added?

Mr. TIROZZI. One of the reasons is that with the grant hopefully increasing fairly dramatically and over time, going to $1 billion, there is going to be some essential coordination of these programs. And by allowing the LEAs to run the programs would just make consummate sense, because it is very difficult to operate the program with grants going to all these individual schools as opposed to going to an LEA, which ideally ties it to their total school reform package, so we do not have isolates out there running community school programs. There is no cohesiveness in that.

So we just thought that as the program was expanding, if it does expand, I think dramatically, to a billion-dollar program, you really have to deal with the structure that does exist, and it is very, very difficult to operate it with individual schools at that level.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, again, that kind of takes the focus away from what the statute was intended to do. I will be talking with the Secretary to see if we can reach some agreement to fund at least some of what was intended in the legislation. Your proposal leaves out that very important aspect of getting communities to work together to use the school facilities to meet a broad range of community needs. To use those schools, not just an LEA, because I think it is incredibly important that we do more to provide the community-school linkages. As the First Lady has said, it takes a village to raise a child, but we are trying to get that school to become an integral part of the whole village.

I have several other questions which I will be submitting to you in writing.

Senator Gregg.

Senator GREGG. As I understand it, the purpose of this new initiative, which will be $800 million, as you just said, is to get kids more up-to-speed, kids who are doing poorly in school, kids who need an after-school program, and kids who are looking for something else to do after school besides just hang around. So you are planning that this is not going to be just a holding tank, but this is going to be an educational exercise for them; is that correct?

Mr. TIROZZI. Yes, sir.

Senator GREGG. So you expect to teach them things like math and science——

Mr. TIROZZI. Science, English, reading, enrichment, talented and gifted programs.

Senator GREGG. Why not just extend the school day?

Mr. TIROZZI. That is really a local decision in terms of whether they want to extend the local school day. That involves locally-negotiated contracts with school districts and their employees.

Senator GREGG. Well, isn't this also a local decision whether or not they want to use the schools as community schools? I mean, they are both local decisions.

Mr. TIROZZI. Yes, it is a local decision, but having been a superintendent and having worked with a local school board and with contracts, it is one thing to say we are going to operate an after-school program that will extend the day, as opposed to simply extending the day with your regular faculty. It is much easier to do

it this way than to go through a negotiated process which, really, at the Federal level, we could not have any involvement with.

Senator GREGG. So you are saying the reason we will not extend the day is because the labor unions would oppose it.

Mr. TIROZZI. Well, it is not only that. Candidly, the figure we would have to talk to you about would be substantially higher than a billion dollars if you wanted to extend the day, because when you extend the day, you are going to have to extend a number of things. In particular, you are going to have to extend the salaries of the people who work there, and 85 to 90 percent——

Senator GREGG. No, no, no, no, no.

Mr. TIROZZI. No? Well——

Senator GREGG. You have a program here that is $800 million. You are going to affect maybe 30 school districts, 100 school districts—I do not know—you are not going to impact a significant percentage of the school districts in this country with this program.

If you are talking about having an impact, you are talking about this program being a multiple-billion-dollar program, which will have to hire people who will have to have contracts—the same problems you would have if you had to deal with extending the school day.

My point is I think the reason extending the school day is not being considered here is because this Department is essentially a captive of the labor unions, and it would not want to affront the labor unions. That is why you are not proposing extending the school day.

Now, that is a comment. You do not have to respond to it, and I do not expect you to respond to it, and I do not want you to respond to it, because I know what your response will be, which is no. But I am telling you——

Mr. TIROZZI. No.

Senator GREGG [CONTINUING]. But I am telling you the truth, and you do not have to accept it, whether you like it or not.

The second issue I have is that you propose as an administration a variety of initiatives here which cost a significant amount of money, all of them well-intentioned, I am sure. Have you ever heard of special education?

Mr. TIROZZI. Of course, yes.

Senator GREGG. Do you know what the Federal law says relative to the funding of special education, what the percentage of Federal contribution should be?

Mr. TIROZZI. Yes.

Senator GREGG. It is 40 percent; correct?

Mr. TIROZZI. Yes.

Senator GREGG. What percent is the Federal Government presently spending on special education?

Mr. TIROZZI. Approximately 8 or 9 percent—approximately.

Senator GREGG. So why didn't the administration come forward and say we should do what we are committed to do under special education for the special needs children, rather than come forward with a variety of new initiatives which are independent of that?

Mr. TIROZZI. Again, I think one of the problems we have in all of our budget requests is that people tend to compartmentalize everything and isolate programs. If you step back—and by the way,

I am a strong supporter of quality and appropriate special education programs—but in the last 2 years, the Federal Government has increased its commitment by about 65 percent in appropriations——

Senator GREGG. No, no. Congress has done that.

Mr. TIROZZI. I am sorry—the Congress. Thank you.

Senator GREGG. The administration in the last 2 years has sent up budget bills which have not increased special education funding at all.

Mr. TIROZZI. There has been a commitment of approximately a 65 percent increase over the last 2 years, and I think if you look at a number of the other proposals that are on the table, they in a variety of ways serve and can help special education youngsters.

For example, if we made a commitment in this country to lower class size in the primary grades to 18 in a classroom, having been a principal and a superintendent, I can tell you that that would make a significant difference in terms of teachers working with individual children and their problems, and over time, you would probably see fewer referrals to special education. If you look at America Reads, which provides additional service to youngsters, that can assist special education youngsters. This type of program can assist special education youngsters. I could go through all of the initiatives. They all, in a variety of ways, would impact on special education youngsters. And I do not think the answer is only to put money into special education, but in and of itself, I think that over time, what we have to face is the fact that there is still a significant number of kids referred to special education who probably have significant problems in reading and writing, and because they lack those skills, they act out in different ways, and many are misdiagnosed.

I think that if we look realistically at the total budget request and try to put all the parts together, that makes more sense to me than just saying let us increase special education or let us increase regular education. It is one of the reasons why, in Title I, we went to a program called "schoolwides," where we could put all of our Federal money on the table, including special education, to look at the total school population.

So the only way I could answer the question, Senator, is to say that we think we are looking at this in a very comprehensive way and not in an isolated way, and that has been the policy direction.

Senator GREGG. Well, let me tell you the way I think you are looking at it. The Federal Government made a commitment to local school districts that it would do 40 percent of the cost of special education. From my experience—I cannot speak for anybody else in this town—but from my experience, the single biggest problem which the local school districts have—in funding smaller class size, better computer structures within their school systems, more arts, more humanities, more foreign language, more interest in sports if that is the desire of the school—the single biggest impediment to their capacity to fund those things which they may decide to do at the local level is the fact that their resources are being allocated by the Federal Government as a result of the special education law not being fully funded.

In other words, when the Federal Government does not pay its 40 percent and only pays 10 percent, the school districts have to pick up the 30 percent, and special ed is the single biggest cost in almost every school district of the Federal mandate. In fact, in the school districts in my State, special education costs are running around 20 percent.

So the Federal Government's failure to come in and do its job has reduced the flexibility of the local school districts to make decisions on allocations of resources which they might otherwise want to make.

So what you are essentially saying is that we are going to underfund special education here at the Federal level so that we here at the Federal level can decide for you at the local level whether or not you should have 18 kids in your class, whether or not you should have a special reading program if we decided to do it categorically from the Federal level, whether or not you will have some other sort of federally-mandated program for the special community in the local school district, which we will pay for from the Federal level. How are we going to pay for it? How are we going to pay for this new, directed program from the Federal Government, a couple of which you have listed right here? We are going to take the money which we were supposed to send you in special ed and use that money.

If the Federal Government paid the special ed bill as it is supposed to pay it, if this administration would stand up and do the job for special needs kids which it said it was going to do, pay the 40 percent, then the local school districts would have the flexibility to go out and do the other programs that they may want to do. And I suggest to you that they can make a lot better decision on how they spend their local dollars than you can make by telling them how to spend it from the Federal level.

Mr. TIROZZI. I guess the only way I would attempt to answer that, Senator, is that once the money is specifically earmarked for special education, it can only be spent for special education. And my sense, having been in schools for years, is that it makes consummate sense to try to be more proactive and preventive rather than reactive at this end.

I guess what I am trying to say to you, Senator, is that unless we figure out ways to work with young children, especially the first, second and third graders in particular, and really work on their basic skills in reading and math, and we are going to have more and more youngsters referred, probably, into special education. That is a huge concern that I have, especially in programs like learning disabled youngsters.

Secretary Riley is totally committed to special education and trying to work it through.

Senator GREGG. Well, then, where is the 40 percent funding?

Mr. TIROZZI. I think part of the answer resides in many of the proposals that are on the table right now.

Senator GREGG. No, no, no.

Mr. TIROZZI. I believe that, sir.

Senator GREGG. Just a second. What you are sending up here are categorical grants which schools will have to comply with in order

to get money to do special things that you have decided at the Federal level should be done at the local school level.

At the same time, you are saying to the local schools: We are not going to fund the program that we are requiring you to pay for, which is taking away from you the flexibility to make the decisions at the local level that might have funded the programs that you are now telling them they have to pursue under a Federal program. And it is not an issue, as you stated it in your opening statement, of the fact that the special needs child gets the funds from the special education, and therefore it is categorical to only them. If the Federal Government were paying the 40 percent, that would free up the 30 percent of the money that is now being spent at the local level to pay the Federal share of the special education dollars, and those would be dollars that would be available at the local level.

We have just passed a law, the IDEA reauthorization bill, which said that when we hit $4 billion, local school districts would have the ability to spend the special ed dollars that were coming back in the way they deemed appropriate.

Mr. TIROZZI. Yes.

Senator GREGG. So the flexibility would be there. The basic problem in the local school districts today is the inability to pay for special education and the fact that the Federal Government has failed to pay the cost of that. And your Department's insistence that it is not going to pay the 40 percent, that you are only going to pay the 10 percent after the law said you would pay the 40 percent, is really sticking it to the special needs kids. More importantly, it sticks it to their parents, who end up in terrible fights in these school district meetings because the parents of the other children and the local taxpayers look to them and blame the education of their children as the reason why their kids are not getting an adequate education.

The failure of your Department to come through with the 40 percent has put the special needs child and the special needs parent in an intolerable position in these school areas. I know. I happened to be head of a special needs center before I got this job.

So I do think that it is really arrogant of the Department of Education to come here today and the President to come to the Congress and say we want $13 billion in new education programs when you are not wiling to fund the needs of the special education children in this country which the law says you are supposed to fund.

Mr. TIROZZI. Senator, if I may build on your own words with "arrogance" and what-have-you, I think if there has ever been arrogance, it has existed since the day the law was passed. I mean, there have been other administrations and other Congresses where the same types of decisions have been made. I was a superintendent when special ed was, quote-unquote, never fully funded.

So I do think that with a 65 percent increase in the last 2 years, there has been a tremendous movement forward in this administration. And I do want to say that the programs that we are recommending I do not personally interpret the way you do. I think they have tremendous flexibility. If you have after-school programs, no one is telling you what to do. You can go to enrichment, you can work with students who are failing, you can provide reading, you can provide math, you can work with special education students.

Reducing class size to 18, the districts pick their own teachers, they have their own curricula, they select their own textbooks.

These are just broad policy directions that we think can make a difference. I have been in education for 30 years, and I stand before you and say I think they can make a difference. I think they will help special education children. And I am not an arrogant person.

Senator GREGG. The Department is.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Wellstone.

Senator WELLSTONE. Well, I am trying to figure out how to make the transition—welcome, Dr. Tirozzi. [Laughter.]

I was thinking about what Senator Gregg said, and I have heard him say it before, and I do not know that I would agree with all that he said, but I do think that he has spoken with quite a bit of conviction, Mr. Chairman, as well as a lot of hands-on experience as Governor with this.

I think, Senator Gregg, that some of these parents do get put in terrible positions and do get scapegoated. I just do not see it as a zero sum game. I would like to see us live up to our commitment in this area, and I would also like to see us deal with some other really important challenges, and this is one of them, and I guess that is the transition I would make.

Dr. Tirozzi, I appreciate your leadership and I appreciate what you are trying to do. Do you have any idea of what percentage of the CCDBG funds right now go to after-school care?

Mr. TIROZZI. About one-third of the money; they serve about 300,000 students, Senator.

Senator WELLSTONE. Let me just keep going with this, and I will tell you there are no trick questions; in part, I am trying to find out from my own mind the best way to—there are two issues to me. One is the amount of investment. In some ways, I think the irony, given what Senator Gregg said, is that albeit you have to start somewhere, I think that alongside need, we are going to be providing just a fraction of the funding that is really needed.

What has been the track record of the money that has been delivered through this infrastructure of the CCDBG in the after-school programs?

Mr. TIROZZI. Susan Wilhelm is a member of our staff and works very closely with this program, so she can respond to that.

Senator WELLSTONE. Fine. What I am trying to get at, of course—in my own mind, I have been working on a child care bill, and I am absolutely convinced this needs to be done, including the after-school care—I keep thinking it is great to have new initiatives, and I know we started last year, but I keep thinking that this is an infrastructure that has worked really well. Why don't we just essentially invest in the funding through this?

I am under the impression that at about a third of the funding, we have gotten a lot of success out there. Am I wrong or right?

Ms. Wilhelm. The money that currently goes out through the CCDBG goes to States. The States make the decisions about how they are going to run their programs. The money is generally used for two purposes. It either goes directly to parents, where they go out and purchase care, or sometimes, States contract with providers for so many slots.

The difference between that money and this money is that this money addresses the supply side by using facilities to create centers so that parents have more places to choose from in terms of access to programs.

Also, the administration's proposal to increase funding for the 21st Century Community Schools Program would provide the facilities for the after-school programs. As I understand it, the CCDBG money does not actually pay for the facilities and the infrastructure for those kinds of activities to take place.

Mr. TIROZZI. To State it another way, just making the schools available as a wonderful resource—the facilities—can enhance the very program you are talking about.

Dr. Ed Zigler at Yale University speaks very eloquently about a school of the 21st century with a different paradigm, in a sense. The school is open from 6 in the morning until 6 at night, providing child care, wrap-around day care. Independence, MO, for example, operates all of its schools that way.

I think that what Susan is saying and what we are saying is that getting the schools committed to being open enhances the potential for all types of providers to use school facilities in very different ways other than finding facilities, finding sites, which in and of itself drains dollars from those programs. So we see a nexus here.

Senator WELLSTONE. You are focusing on the schools.

Mr. TIROZZI. We are focusing on the schools delivering the services.

Senator WELLSTONE. But we could—you know, if you have great staff, they will hand you a note with the next question written on it, which would have been my question anyway, I promise you—you all do great work, but I had to say that; my dignity is at issue here—I am trying to figure it out. Here, we have a program which I think has already built up a track record. I think, Mr. Chairman, there is a consensus that this has worked really well. You could add school facilities as an allowable use under the CCDBG, couldn't you? This is mandatory money. Why wouldn't we do it that way?

Mr. TIROZZI. Well, I think one of the goals in looking at a broader concept of the community school—and first, I want to step back, Senator. I agree with you on the need, and to repeat my answer, I think the schools can help to serve that need by making the schools available to serve those kids——

Senator WELLSTONE. Yes, I am with you on that.

Mr. TIROZZI. But I am saying in addition, there are other needs which the school can serve other than just being open for those purposes—providing enrichment programs, working with students who are failing in school, providing more technology experiences, even getting into adult literacy, working with community-based organizations, developing social-related programs. We just think there is an even broader need than just that need.

Also, all of the surveys we have seen from parents tell us they really, really like the idea of using the schools, even for child care.

Senator WELLSTONE. Well, Mr. Chairman, I will ask a different question. I think some of the best work that I have been able to do as a Senator, or at least what I have learned the most from, aside from work in Minnesota, has been some travel around the

country, mainly in low-income communities. And I certainly have found that those schools, like Canton School in Baltimore, which is a middle school, that work really well, are schools which are beacons in the community because they are places that never give up on the kids, parents are welcome, teachers are free to teach, and where, each day, when a child walks in the door, that child knows that he or she is loved, and so on.

So I am all for doing this. I just want to say one more time before I run out of time that I still think it might make sense, given the success of what we have been able to do through the CCDBG program, to look at that a little more carefully as to how we accomplish these goals. But it is not a major difference of opinion.

I keep coming back to the welfare bill, and every time I get a chance to, I will, and as soon as there is a vehicle on the floor of the Senate where I can bring some amendments up, I am going to. One thing I have found with the welfare bill is that now that many more single parents, who are almost always women, are now being required to work, we have yet even more first and second graders coming home alone, sometimes in some very dangerous neighborhoods.

I was in East Los Angeles—and I will end on this—where I talked to a mother who really wanted to tell me over and over again that she wanted to work. She felt that burden of proof to let me know that, "I am not lazy; I want to work." And she is working. She is not making much above minimum wage, which is another issue, because I think that if we look at the data in this country, almost all the jobs that these women are getting pay barely above minimum wage, and when they lose their health care, they may be worse off, and their children may be worse off. But she then broke down and cried, and I said, "I do not understand. You are working, and you seem to feel good about that." And she said that she is terrified because from the time school gets out—every day, she used to go to that school—she lives in a public housing project, Mr. Chairman—she used to go to the school—a lot of these single parents do that, and they walk their children home—and she was there. So she is terrified about what happens from the time her child leaves school until the time the child gets home—and I went and visited there she lived—and then here child is told, "You go in, you lock the door, and you take no phone calls."

So a lot of these children do not play outside. I know that sounds melodramatic, but it is true. So this is terribly important, but I would like to communicate a message to the administration. You all created—not you, Mr. Tirozzi—you created this situation, and you had better make it a priority to make sure these kids are not in harm's way, because right now, they are.

No one talked about that, but we had better start talking about it—that is not aimed at you, Mr. Tirozzi, but hey, I have the floor. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I hope you have enjoyed your morning, Mr. Tirozzi. [Laughter.]

Senator WELLSTONE. No, no. He is trying to work on this.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. TIROZZI. Yes. I believe in all this.

The CHAIRMAN. I will just pick on you one more time. The law states that the intent is to use the schools, and it says "by using school facilities, equipment and resources, the community can promote a more efficient use of public education facilities." And your direction is that you do not just have to use the schools—you can go out and rent space to do these things.

So again, it is a real attempt to dramatically change this program. I have no problem with, and—I am a great believer, in doing more in providing after-school activities for our children. But you have got to be careful when you start taking just a piece of legislation and substantially changing it without making the appropriate legislative changes, and then saying those changes can be funded. That has got to be done through the legislative process.

Getting back to Senator Gregg, I do not think anybody can disagree with the position he has taken. I was one of the original drafters of the special education law, and I was one who certainly endorsed putting the 40 percent there. The problem is not either/or; the problem is that the Federal Government, in my mind, should have 10 percent of its budget going to education. If we did, we would have plenty of money to take care of that aspect as well as provide for the needs of this Nation. That is where we were back at the end of World War II. We created the GI bill, and the President has mentioned that. Ten percent of the Federal budget went to education. It was brought close to that back when we had Sputnik, but since that time, we have drifted away considerably. That has put a burden on the schools that I would like to see alleviated.

So I think that we are all trying to say the same thing, but there is no question that the burden placed on the schools by special education is a real drain. We have got to do more about that.

Senator WELLSTONE. Mr. Chairman, can I add one thing to what you said?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Senator WELLSTONE. I think that what you said is just right on the mark. The only other thing I would add, not to take away from what you have said or what Senator Gregg said, is that I think around the country, the other thing—and it is hard for us to get a handle on it at the Federal level—but the property tax as the primary way of financing public education creates an awful lot of difficulty also in terms of how these different needs are met.

The CHAIRMAN. No question about that.

Well, it was a pleasure having you here this morning. You can take that more than one way, but——

Mr. TIROZZI. It was a pleasure to be here, Senator, as always. And could I just say—and I mean this very seriously—I really personally appreciate the commitment you have made to the concept of the community school, and I sincerely hope that Congress will look favorably upon the potential to maximize the way we are using our schools to meet the diverse needs of communities.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, that is the intent of the legislation. I understand the desire to utilize an existing piece of legislation to expand other activities, but that should be done through the legislative process. You will probably run into some difficulty in the Appropriations Committee in that respect.

Thank you. I do look forward to working with you. I am a great believer in the Secretary. I know he is trying his best under the difficult circumstances that we all face when it comes to trying to provide sufficient effort and funds for education.

Thank you very much.

Mr. TIROZZI. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the next panel will find this an enjoyable exercise.

To help us put today's topic into perspective, I am pleased to welcome our second panel of witnesses—Mr. Shepherd Smith, Mr. Brad Luck and Ms. Sue Luck. Sue, it is good to see you again.

Mr. Shepherd Smith is president and founder of the Institute for Youth Development. The Institute is a nonprofit organization dedicated to helping our Nation's children make a successful transition from childhood to adulthood. The work of the Institute is focused on the use of scientific research and principles to guide sound public policy for America's youth. Mr. Smith's interest in youth development grew from his experiences as president and founder of Americans for a Sound AIDS/HIV Policy, where he became acutely aware of the critical need to help youth avoid risky behaviors.

Mr. Brad Luck is a remarkable young man from Essex Junction, VT. In reading about Brad and his activities, I wonder if he has somehow managed to be given more than 24 hours a day. I would like to know how you do it.

Brad is a 4.0 student, quarterback of the high school basketball team—I do not know who printed that——

Senator WELLSTONE. That sounds like the way they play basketball in Vermont, Mr. Chairman. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. You will have to straighten that one out for us, Brad.

Brad has been class president for 2 years, treasurer of the school executive committee, and a member of the community Wellness Committee. In his spare time, Brad is a peer helper, math tutor, volunteer basketball coach, Little League umpire, chair of the School Spirit Committee, and a Big Brother of two elementary school children.

Brad is here today in yet another capacity. He is a founding member and current president of the Essex Teen Center. I can see why Brad was recently chosen to receive the Horatio Alger Outstanding Young American Award for the State of Vermont.

It is easy to understand where Brad gets a lot of his motivation and energy. Sue Luck is executive director of the Greater Burlington YMCA. She has worked with Vermont children and their families for over 25 years. Sue is on the faculty of the YMCA of the U.S.A., is an adjunct educator at Champlain College, and is a nationally-recognized child care trainer. In her spare time, Sue is active in many local organizations in schools. She teaches parenting classes throughout Vermont and recently helped raise funds to build a new Boys and Girls Club and currently oversees the management of that club. As the associate director of the Greater Burlington YMCA, she supervises programs which provide child care for 1,200 students.

I want to thank all of you for being here. You certainly are examples for all of us to look to and admire.

Mr. Smith, please proceed.

STATEMENTS OF SHEPHERD SMITH, PRESIDENT, INSTITUTE FOR YOUTH DEVELOPMENT, WASHINGTON, DC; BRAD LUCK, HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT AND PRESIDENT OF THE ESSEX TEEN CENTER, ESSEX, VT; AND SUE LUCK, ASSOCIATE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, GREATER BURLINGTON YMCA, BURLINGTON, VT

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Senator Jeffords. I appreciate being here before this committee to share our perspective on the fundamental aspects of youth development and the importance of nurturing young Americans at every possible juncture.

It is also a pleasure to be on a panel with a parent and young person who I hope will share some exciting testimony about what we can do in after-school hours with young people throughout this country.

In 1993, Congress funded a significant study on youth behavior known as the Add Health Study, which was recently published in the Journal of the American Medical Association, and it really forms much of the basis for the points that we would like to bring out. Its results are exciting to all of us who seek to understand the implement the best methods of maximizing the potential of America's youth.

The Institute for Youth Development tries to address youth behavior in the context of different risks that affect it in a comprehensive fashion, encouraging risk avoidance messages for alcohol, drugs, sex, tobacco and violence.

In respect to our own study on young people and their parents, we find, consistent with other scientific data, that young people today are really looking for good direction; they really seek a moral compass, if you will. And that is pretty much, among both at-risk and not-at-risk youth, the message that we hear.

We also, as much as we study young people, see that they look at us, and I think we all need to remember as adults that we are role models for them, and I do not think we can do anything to get away from that, but that is very important in respect to thinking about young people today.

Generally, American youth are healthy and happy; generally, they are well-cared-for and have a positive outlook for the future; generally, they avoid risk behaviors as a group and understand what is in their beset interest. There are exceptions to this, of course, and it is to these exceptions that we have a responsibility to also pursue so that they may have better lifetime outcomes.

We have given out this book, and it contains a lot of data that support what we are saying. I would encourage you to look at what interests kids today, what are the main influences in their lives, what compromises their attitudes, beliefs and perceptions.

We are learning how the main influences on youth affect their behavior. What affects them first and foremost is their parents. In this context, legislation that is developed regarding the nurturing of children in any environment needs to encourage parental involvement. While we often think of after-school activities as solely for children because parents cannot be there, parents' influence can in fact be in these programs, either through volunteer work of par-

ents, through supporting parent-child relationships, or other ways in which parents can be involved.

We are also learning a lot about what affects youth in their early development, that they respond best to absolutes rather than to a lot of less directed instruction. Consequently, we are supportive of character education in nurturing programs that will encourage the inclusion, as often as possible, in after-school programs. Universal principles such as worth and potential, rights and responsibilities, fairness and justice, effort and excellence, care and consideration, personal integrity and social responsibility should be taught whenever we have that opportunity.

The lesson here is that we have got to be open to what science tells us today and look carefully at what programs have value and which ones do not. Protective factors for young people identified in the Add Health Study, for example, include having spirituality or religious views, a desire to achieve good grades, looking one's age or younger; pledge of virginity had an awful lot of value, interestingly; high self-esteem is important to young people, as we know; school connectedness and parent-family connectedness are critically important.

So our stereotype of youth needs to be tempered by reality. Only a small percentage of young people participate in most risk-taking behaviors. We must look at those who avoid these behaviors and promote those characteristics for all young people today.

What is germane in this discussion today are the benefits of nurturing by concerned adult mentors and sharing positive character development traits as a means of avoiding youth violence as part of what you should consider.

The hours of 3 to 6, as we know, during the week are the times in which delinquent behavior most often occurs, so it is critically important that we have adult supervision for young people. And the programs, again, should not be just ones that occupy time, but also must convey these fundamental principles.

We need to also reinforce the child-parent bond as often as we can, and in respect to doing that, such programs combined with flextime for workers and other creative business practices that enhance parent-child relationships should be encouraged. Program setting, type, focus and purpose should be given as much flexibility under this legislation as possible. And finally, the best implementation of any program is decided at the local or community level. Getting resources to these efforts as directly as possible should be a major objective in order to best help America's youth.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Smith follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SHEPHERD SMITH

Good morning Mr. Chairman and members of this esteemed committee. It is an honor to be here and share our perspective on fundamental aspects of youth development and the importance of nurturing young Americans at every possible juncture. The latest emerging scientific data serves as a basis for my comments, as well as some tried and true knowledge of young people that has remained constant over the ages.

The Congress in 1993 had the wisdom and foresight to fund the most significant study yet of youth risk behavior. This National Longitudinal Adolescent Health Survey (often referred to as Add Health) was first reported on this past September in

The Journal of the American Medical Association. Its results are exciting to all of us who seek to understand and implement the best methods of the potential value of America's youth. This combined with the emerging data concerning early brain development and childcare is helping us paint a much clearer picture of what is in the best interest of youth today. It is from this perspective that we are able to discuss aspects of the measure you are considering in this hearing.

The Institute for Youth Development also conducts its own independent research which is presently ongoing. Our findings are consistent with those being published in peer review journals. We approach youth development from the perspective of there being an inter-relationship between all risk behaviors—there are protective and risk factors—common to all youth behavior. Our study of children and their parents, both those at risk and those not at risk, reveals a common theme among young people today. They seek clear direction—a moral compass if you will—as well as both need and desire to have strong parental and/or adult mentor bonds. I must underscore the fact that as much as we study youth, the study us. All adults are role models. We can't ever forget that, or get away from that fact.

Generally American youth are healthy and happy. Generally they are well cared for and have a positive outlook for the future. Generally they avoid risk behaviors as a group and understand what is in their best interest. There are options to this, of course, and it is these exceptions that we have a responsibility to also pursue so that they may have better lifetime outcomes.

We have given each member of the committee our "Measuring the Risk" book on America's youth. It is a compilation of data that supports the premise of the statements made in this hearing today. I would encourage you to look at what interests kids today, what the main influences in their lives are, and what comprises their attitudes, beliefs, and perceptions. The Institute for Youth Development seeks to accentuate the positive aspects of youth rather that focus on just the negative.

It is important to be as objective as possible in understanding where young people are today. For example, we see in this booklet that "most teenagers believe that getting an education is important to their lives. Contrary to popular belief they would like to do well in school. Youngsters across the board—white, African-American, and Hispanic—say they admire, rather than look down on, classmates who make good grades." We also know that those who have high aspirations are those who develop well and mostly avoid risk. "Why is that?

We are learning how the influences on youth affect their behavior. What affects them first and foremost are their parents. A number of other factors such as peer attitudes and beliefs, school and other adult mentors, the media, their own religious practices, their experiences in school, and their view of their own future also affect their behavior. In this context, legislation that is developed regarding the nurturing of children in any environment needs to encourage parental involvement. Yes, after school programs are developed because parents can't be there, but it does not mean that is always the case or their influence can't be felt by their children. It is parent connectedness that the recent Add Health study lays out as the greatest protective factor for children today.

The outcome of research regarding early brain development tells us that young people, particularly at an early age, learn far more through directive instruction than abstract instruction. We err when we believe that children should be given great latitude at early ages for self-determination. This is a very difficult task for them without good direction. Consequently, we are supportive of character education in nurturing programs and would encourage the inclusion as often as possible in after school programs or pre-school programs in this sort of direction for young people. Character education not only helps develop higher self-respect and self-esteem, but also helps insulate children from harm by reinforcing resiliency factors. Principles such as worth and potential, rights and responsibilities, fairness and justice, effort and excellence, care and consideration, personal integrity, and social responsibility should be taught.

Clear, concise messages connect with youth. When we look at the often-maligned message of "just say no" used by Nancy Reagan in the 1980s, we may want to re-evaluate our skepticism in light of what we now know. This message, in fact, resonates with young people. It is unambiguous and gives clear direction. We can see the effect of that consistent message given in the 1980s: a significant decrease in drug use. Yes, there are many other factors that contributed to that decline, but certainly it had a major impact while it was used. The demarcation from that message showed a reduction in the perceived risk of harmfulness of drugs by youth and an increase in drug use after its discontinuance.

The lesson here is that we have to be open to what the science tells us today and look carefully at what programs have value and which ones don't. In that vein, we have recently seen research that analyzed the 1991 and 1993 Household Survey

data of over 26,000 young people questioned. It showed a pattern of risk behavior that we might not otherwise understand or accept since so much of our focus now is on tobacco as a "gateway" drug. That study published in *The Journal of Adolescent Health* last year showed that young people first began drinking alcohol followed 17 or 18 months later by cigarette smoking followed 10 or 11 months later by initiation of sexual intercourse. Researchers found no set pattern of marijuana use, though, that is critically important to understand in light of the dramatic increases we have seen in that substance over the last 5 or 6 years.

Protective factors for young people identified in the Add Heath study include: having spirituality or religious views, a desire to achieve good grades, looking one's age or younger, a pledge of virginity, high self esteem, school connectedness and parent/family connectedness. Other conforming data shows that those who drink the least, smoke the least, and use drugs are African-American young people followed by whites then Hispanics. Unfortunately those that put themselves most at risk for sex and violence are in the African-American community. But our stereotype of youth needs to be tempered by reality. Only a small percentage of young people participate in most of these risk-taking behaviors. We must look at those who avoid these behaviors and promote those characteristics for all young people today.

What is very germane to your consideration regarding after school care far all school-age children are the benefits of nurturing by concerned adult mentors and sharing positive character development traits as a means of avoiding youth violence. Delinquent activities occur during school days most often between the hours of 3:00 to 6:00 PM. For those children whose parents are unable to be with them during this time period it is critical that they have adult supervision and involvement. We see from the Add Health study that parental presence reduces alcohol, drug and cigarette usage as well. This should also be true for youth involved in programs that have good adult supervision.

I would like to point out that the parent-child bond is the most important of all protective factors. Government should always work to support, not supplant, that bond. We also must accept that children cannot always be with their parents. For most, a large portion of their day they will be in school. Between that time and when most parents return home from work it is imperative that they receive care and support from trained adult mentors.

Programs that not only occupy their time and gain their attention, but also have character education qualities and give sound direction are the ones that are going to help our youth maximize their potential. Such programs, combined with flex time for workers and other creative business practices that enhance parent/child relationships will give America its brightest future. Consequently, program setting type, focus and purpose should be given as much flexibility under this legislation as possible. Lastly, the best implementation of any program is decided at the local or community level—getting resources to these efforts as directly as possible should be a major objective in order to best help America's youth.

Thank you Mr. Chairman and committee members for hearing this perspective.

The CHAIRMAN. Brad, are you ready?

Mr. LUCK. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. OK. Please go ahead.

Mr. LUCK. Thank you very much for the opportunity to be here, Senator Jeffords and committee members. It is an honor, and I feel privileged to be here and to be able to speak with you.

I also commend this committee for inviting input from youth and teens while looking at after-school programs and prevention projects. Obviously, the best and most logical and effective way to deal with an issue is to go directly to the source and speak with people who can offer personal perspective and thoughts and ideas, and I hope I can help you out in that way.

I am delighted to share with you some of my experiences and concepts about teens and youth. I am here today to enlighten you about what teens need during out-of-school hours and what types of prevention programs work. I will be sharing an example of what is working in our community, and I invite your participation and support for other communities around the Nation.

The biggest and most crucial element for teens and youth today is prevention, and not just any prevention, but positive prevention.

Teens need something to do when they are out of school and on weekend nights. As you know, this is the prime time, as Mr. Smith has just said, for vandalism, crime and drug use among teenagers. Teens need a place to go and something productive to do.

In our community, there is very little for teens to do, and often around the Nation, teens have little money, few places to go, not a lot to do, and a lot of free time. And when you combine all of those factors together, it opens up opportunity for trouble. I believe this puts all teens at risk.

In our community, we have created a teen center. Two years ago, a group of my peers was getting sick of having nothing to do, and we discussed some options of what things to do, and we were really getting sick of having nothing. We thought a teen center sounded like a great idea, but it was something that we could never achieve.

We mentioned the idea to some adults, and they thought it sounded great, and the idea floated around the community for a while. After a while, a community organization applied for a State grant, and we applied for some State funds to get some money to open up a teen center and get things moving. But our community did not get that money, because we were not seen as an "at-risk" community; in other words, our community did not have a lot of high drug and alcohol problems, and we were kind of stable, that is, we were average compared to the State in drug and alcohol use.

So we did not get the money, but there was a lot of enthusiasm in the community for the teen center, and that is really where our journey began. We continued by holding a 32-hour retreat which 30 students and several adults from the community attended, and we really sat down and planned who we were, what we wanted to become, and how we could become it. For the next 9 months, a group of 20 students and three adults met every Sunday night for an hour and a half to 2 hours. We put together and documented a plan for a teen center. We drew up what we would like in the center, the furniture, the hours we would be open, the rules, what our directors would be like, and every minor detail that you can imagine.

We researched other centers. We joined the Vermont Coalition of Teen Centers, and we also looked at some of the faults and failures of a previous teen center in our community just 10 years prior.

Our teen board obviously was very teen-dominated. We had 20 teens and three adults. So this was very much a student- and teen-driven activity.

From the start, we were looking for community support. We held a community forum—all of our meetings were open to the public—and we began to make presentations to all the local groups—the Rotary, the Lions Club, school board, school faculties, the VFW, and more. We informed people about our group, our mission and our vision, and gradually, there was a lot of enthusiasm and motivation for a teen center in our community.

The press began to take a major interest, and starting just with the community paper and then moving to all the local papers, the major papers, TV, radio and magazines. And there was a lot of hype around our State about "these kids in Essex" and how hard-working and committed they were. But really, we had no teen center; we had nothing tangible. We were just meeting for 9 months straight, planning a teen center.

Our problem was that we did not have any money. We were waiting patiently for a rant opportunity to open up or a local corporation to sponsor us for our first year, but nobody was willing to give 20 teens and adults $30,000 and say, "Good luck." There was no money out there for kids who wanted to be better. Again, there were plenty of funds for kids who had already been in trouble or kids who were addicted and needed to get out of trouble, but nothing to keep kids who were not yet in trouble out of trouble.

Time and motivation for our board was on the decline, and kids were getting sick of still having no teen center, but yet they were working so hard. So we had to put together something really quickly to raise money—and we did. It was our "30 in 30" campaign. That is, we raised $30,000 in 30 days. We put together 25 teams of parents and their teens to sell $100 raffle tickets with a $5,000 prize. After 30 days, we raised $32,600, and the prizewinner, the Lions Club, a group that we had visited prior, donated the money back, so we kept all of our funds.

Our community really embraced us at that point and really rallied behind us to raise this money. The police department, local clubs and organizations and our schools were really 100 percent behind us.

Over this past summer, the teens once again hired the directors. We have two directors who are really crucial to the success of our center, and their combined salary is $20,000. The rest of the money goes to our operational funds. Since our opening, we have had $35,000 come to us from the local IBM and $5,000 from the local McDonalds.

We are open 5 days a week, Tuesday through Thursday, 3:30 to 6 p.m., and Friday and Saturday nights from 7 to 11 p.m. We have all sorts of things in the center. We are limited to only 1,000 square feet of space, which is pretty rough on us; we have outgrown our space for quite a while. But we have a pool table, a fooseball table, an air hockey table, TVs, VCRs, couches, office equipment, kitchen supplies, Nintendo, play stations, arcade games, and various things to keep the students active.

We are very much still student-led, and our board consists of 25 students and five adults now, and we meet biweekly, set all the policies and run all the events. We do a lot to give back to the community that has given so much to us. We participate in Green-Up Day, Make a Difference Day; we helped to raise money for a lock sick mother, and we have also met with the Senior Citizen Center several times and hosted other junior high groups.

This past week, we were visited by Attorney General Janet Reno and our Senator Patrick Leahy. They got a tour of our center, and we had a little conference with them to tell them about our center and ask them what their thoughts were. Ms. Reno said, "You have got to prevent crime in the first place. It would cost less if we did it right." Senator Leahy added, "The easiest crime to handle is the one that does not happen." I could not agree more.

The message and the mission of our teen center is simple. Our mission statement reads: "To provide an environment for a diverse group, promoting healthy behavior in a social atmosphere and educational and recreational opportunities."

Our goal is to stop the crimes and stop the accidents from happening. We want to prevent. We are not interested in telling teens more about drug use and how it is bad; no more lectures and no more movies about drugs and how they affect your body. We are not interested in increasing the penalties for teens when they get in trouble or when they sue drugs, and we are definitely not interested in having teen curfews or lessened driving privileges. We are simply trying to provide something to do and a place to go for these teens.

Ms. Reno probably hit it right on the money when she said that this kind of prevention costs less. We have been open now for 5 months, and we have served 800 teens. So far, we have spent about $15,000. When you do the math, that is a cost of about $20 per student in our community, and that maybe be a student who comes to the center every day, 5 days a week, or a student who has just been to the teen center once. Regardless, either way, they have stayed out of trouble one more time, and that is one less time for a police officer to have to break up a party, a store owner to be missing items, a window to be broken, a teen to drive home after drinking. It is one less time and one less opportunity for trouble.

Our community only needed $30,000 to start this up, and the funds that you all are dealing with involve millions and billions of dollars. So that for us to raise $30,000 on our own and start a teen center and serve 800 kids in 5 months is pretty substantial. Just image the impact you have with the money and the funds you are dealing with.

Right now, we do not know where to look for funding for years 3, 4, and 5. We have nowhere to look except in the mirror, and look to ourselves and figure out how we can raise $30,000 again each year. So we are really looking for State and Federal moneys to come. We need grant opportunities, start-up funds, matching grants—really, in general, moneys for the average kid, not just moneys for those who are in trouble, but moneys to prevent others from getting in trouble. That is really our main cause.

In closing, I will say that prevention is the only way. Providing alternatives and opportunities for teens after school and on the weekends is the best way to decrease teen crime and drug use. There is no perfect solution, obviously, to the decreased crime use and drug use among teens, but this would be a good start. Programs, activities and teen centers allow diverse populations of teens to have something to do.

I hope you all realize the potential you possess to support teens, all teens, and to truly make a difference.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. That was excellent testimony and very, very well done.

Mr. LUCK. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Luck follows:]

46-811 98 - 3

February 25, 1998

Senator Jeffords and Committee Members:

Thank you for the opportunity to be here today. It is an honor and I feel privileged to speak with you all. I also commend this committee for inviting input from teens and youth while looking at after school programs and prevention projects. The most logical and effective way to deal with an issue is to speak with the source and the people who can offer personal thoughts and ideas.

My name is Brad Luck and I am a 16 year old Junior at Essex High School in Vermont. I am very involved in my community and school and I am delighted to share with you some of my experiences and concepts about youth and teens.

I am here today to enlighten you about what teens today need during out of school hours and what type of prevention programs work. I'll be sharing an example of what is currently working in Essex Junction, Vermont, and I invite your participation and support for teens everywhere.

The biggest and most crucial element for teens and youth today is prevention. Not just any prevention though, positive prevention. Teens need something to do after school and on weekend nights. As you know, this is the prime time for vandalism, crime, and drug use among teenagers. What youth need is alternatives to these poor choices. Without a doubt, a large contribution to teen crime and drug use is boredom. A teen with nothing to do is a potential problem. Adults have work, children, bars, dance clubs, restaurants, money and more to keep them busy in their free time, if they even have any. Teens have little money, few places to go, not a lot to do, and a lot of free time. I believe this puts all teens "at risk." That's why in Essex we have created a Teen Center.

Two years ago, a group of my peers were getting sick of having nothing to do. We began to think of what we could do and a teen center sounded like a great idea, but something that we could never achieve. We mentioned the idea to some adults and they thought it was great. A lot of motivation and enthusiasm began to arise when a community organization applied for a grant for teen center monies. Our community was seen as a "wealthy community," and we didn't get the grant. If we had been able to show that we had high drug and alcohol problems, we may have gotten funding. Our problem was we were trying to avoid drug and alcohol problems. It seems no one had money for that.

Our journey began. We held a 32 hour retreat with thirty teens and several adults. We really focused on who we were, what we wanted to become, and how we could get there. For the next nine months, we met every Sunday night for an hour and a half to two hours. We created a plan and documented our ideas, such as: rules, furniture, what would be inside, when we would be open, and every detail you can imagine. We researched other teen centers, joined the Vermont Coalition of Teen Centers, and even explored the faults of a previous teen center in our community just ten years ago. Our board, comprised of 20 students and 3 adults, was clearly teen dominated and teen led. I have had the privilege of being President of the board since our beginning.

From the start, we were looking for community support. We held a community forum, all of our meetings were open to the public, and we began to make presentations to local groups. The Rotary, Lions, School Boards, School Faculties, a Business and Professionals Association, the VFW, and more. We informed people about our group, our mission, and our vision. Gradually, we began to gain community support and some enthusiasm. People believed us and, more importantly, believed in us. The press took interest, beginning with the community paper and stretching to all local papers, the major papers, t.v., radio, and magazines. We were a great cause but we still had nothing to show for it. No teen center, just a bunch of hard working and committed kids.

We were waiting patiently for a grant opportunity to open or a local corporation to provide some initial funding. But, no one in their right mind was willing to give 20 teens and 3 adults $30,000 and say good luck. Again, no money for good kids trying to be better. There were plenty of funds for troubled youth, but nothing for kids who wanted to stay out of trouble. Time and motivation was on a decline. We had to act fast, and we did. We set out on a campaign to raise $30,000 in 30 days. We sold $100 raffle tickets with a prize of $5,000. We sent out 25 teams of parents with their teens to sell the tickets. After our 30 days, we raised $32,600 and the prize winners, the Lions Club, donated the money back. Our community really embraced us and rallied behind us for our success. The police department, local clubs and organizations, and our school gave us their support, 100% from the get go.

Over this past summer, the teens hired two local directors who are both teachers and life-long residents of our community. They are great and are crucial to our current success. We have been open since October and are doing excellent. We have had over 800 different teens use our facility at one time or another. We are open Tuesday through Thursday (3:30-6:00p.m.) and Friday and Saturday nights (7:00-11:00p.m.). The majority of our funds support the directors combined salary of $20,000 while the rest goes to operational expenses. Since our success, the local IBM has donated $35,000 and the local McDonalds $5,000. We have a pool table, foosball table, air hockey table, basketball arcade game, 36" t.v., VCR, four t.v.'s with Sony Playstations and Nintendo 64's, office equipment, kitchen supplies, couches, and a soda machine. Not too bad!

We are still very much student led. We now have a board of 25 students and 5 adults. We meet bi-weekly, set all policies, and plan all events. Students have tremendous ownership in who we are and what we do. This is the main reason for our success. We also give back to our community who has given so much to us. We have participated in Green Up Day, Make A Difference Day, raised money for a local sick mother, met with the Senior Citizen Center, and hosted junior high groups.

Recently we have been visited by Attorney General Janet Reno and Senator Patrick Leahy. They got a tour of our center and we had a conference to tell them about our center and to have them share some of their thoughts. Ms. Reno said "You've got to prevent crime in the first place.....It would cost less if we did it right." Senator Leahy added "The easiest crime to handle is the one that doesn't happen," and I couldn't agree more.

The objective of the Teen Center is simple. Our mission statement says: "To provide an environment for a diverse group, promoting healthy behavior in a social atmosphere and educational and recreational opportunities." We want to stop the crimes

and accidents from happening, we want to prevent. Not by informing teens more about the consequences of drug use and that it is bad. Not by having more severe penalties for guilty teens. Not by having teen curfews or lessened driving privileges. Simply, by providing something to do and someplace to go.

Ms. Reno couldn't have been more correct when she said that this type of prevention costs less. Look at the numbers. We alone have served 800 teens in five months. We raised $30,000 on our own as an operating budget for one year and we have spent roughly $15,000 to date. With our attendance, that is less than $20 per teen. Whether it be a regular who is at the Center five days a week, or someone who's been there once, they have been out of trouble one less time. And that's one less time for a police officer to break up a party, a store owner to be missing items, a window to be broken, or a teen to drive home after drinking. You all are dealing with millions of dollars and our community only needed $30,000 for one year. We've done so much for so little. Just think of the impact you can have and the problems you can prevent, an investment that would pay big dividends.

Unfortunately money is our biggest issue. Space comes in second. We raised the funds for a one year budget and local donors have supplied funds for our second year, but what about year three, four, and five. Our community and our teens can only support us for so long. Sustainability is an issue we deal with every week. Space is our other major problem. We have grown out of our 1000 square feet of space. Fortunately, due to the generosity of our town, it is rent free. Anything larger and the rent fee's would begin to add up. We need state and federal sources for teen prevention money. Money for teen centers, teen programs, and even one time teen events. Right now, we have nowhere to turn to, but to look to ourselves in the mirror to find future funds. We need funding options, seed money, matching grants, opportunities for regular kids. Not just those who are already in trouble, but also those who hope to never be. I have been asked to share our model in numerous other communities. It would be so great if they had a place to turn to seek start-up funds. Then 800 more kids could be served, and 800 more, and so on.

In closing, I will leave you with this: Prevention is the only way. Providing alternatives and opportunities for teens after school and on the week ends is the best way to decrease teen crime and drug use. There is no perfect solution to eliminate crime and drug use, but this is a good start. Programs, activities, and teen centers allow diverse populations of teens to have something to do. I hope that you all will realize the potential you possess to support teens, all teens, and to truly make a difference. I thank you for time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Brad Luck

Brad Luck
President of the Essex Teen Center

The CHAIRMAN. Ms. Luck, please proceed.

Ms. LUCK. Thank you. I think I should have preceded Brad.

What a privilege and honor it is to be here today. I am Sue Luck, and I am pleased to provide testimony regarding the needs of children during their out-of-school time. I bring you both the perspective of a parent of two children and as an advocate for children and families, having worked in this field with the YMCA for the past 25 years.

It is gratifying to participate in this type of hearing and to know that you value the words and the opinions of a 16-year-old. It is particularly gratifying that the 16-year-old is my son. But from a parental perspective, I must echo Brad's sentiment regarding teens needing resources and support.

Our small community did rally and did provide support, and we support our kids, but so much more is needed. As Brad indicated, so much can be done for so little. When you think about it, $30,000 and 800 kids in 3 months—that is phenomenal. That is grassroots community work. If those dollars are available to student groups such as Brad's, they would eat them up, and they would run with them. We do not need millions—just small amounts—to make big differences.

The type of work his group has done has been collaborative, it has been community-based; it is supportive, and it has raised the bar in our community about who teens are and what they give and what their potential is. That is immeasurable. It is just immeasurable.

So I say to you this is prevention at its best. I am sure you are familiar with the asset-building approach out of the Search Institute in Minnesota. I believe this is an absolute product of this. They may not know that—actually, Brad does, but his group may not. The more assets they were given, the more energy, the more support, the greater they became, the stronger they were, and the greater their outcome.

So as a parent, I must say to you that I think it is a tough role, but I know that it cannot be done alone. When teenagers hit those preadolescent and prepubescent years, it takes schools, it takes YMCAs, it takes community organizations, community leaders, business leaders. It takes a lot of folks to build a whole community around children and to play a role in building a supportive environment for them. They need a bigger picture than just a parent can provide at home—a good parent, a struggling parent, a challenged parent. Kids need the bigger picture. And really, we are all stakeholders in the positive development of youth today.

As associate executive director of the Greater Burlington YMCA, I have the distinct pleasures of overseeing programs that serve 1,200 children a day in after-school care. Our YMCA is the largest provider of child care in the State of Vermont, and I know firsthand the challenge families and providers face when presented with the dilemma of finding and then maintaining high-quality care during out-of-school hours.

Stepping back from Vermont, but not to delay the issues, because the statistics have been well-stated here today, approximately 24 million school-age children with working parents require care.

Even more startling—and I so appreciated your comment, Senator Wellstone, about children who are home alone—experts estimate that nearly 5 million school-age children spend time without adult supervision each week—5 million children home alone. Sometimes, the coined phrase around that is "latchkey children." And whether they are home in safe situations, or home with the door locked and told not to answer the telephone, what kind of environment are we building for children during their out-of-school hours, and what is the message we are giving them about their value to us as a society?

As you know, juvenile crime data reflects that peak hours for juvenile crimes are 3 to 8. After-school hours are high-risk hours, and we need to take care of our children.

so what do we do? What can we do as a society? I feel tickled, and I am really excited that public officials and community-based organizations and leaders are coming to the table and are coming to realize the significance and critical importance of high-quality programs during out-of-school hours. At the YMCA, this is welcome news. Caring for children through the delivery of high-quality programs is something that our national organization has been behind for a long time. I get to be the local deliverer of those services, supported by my national organization.

We provide nationally school-age care for over 400,000 every day at about 8,000 locations. We are committed to bringing affordable, high-quality care to American families who need it. I might add that as we think about locations for school-age care, school-based programs are incredibly valuable, but they are not the only place where high-quality care can be had, and we cannot overlook YMCAs and recreation facilities or grassroots community organizations and teen centers which have been building programs for years and years and doing it well. So I hope that as we examine that, we will consider all of the places where quality care can happen.

Quality is the key. If we can embrace what quality means for school-age children and what happens to them after school, we will have hit our mark. As you think back, and as anyone over 30 in this room thinks back about your after-school time, you can probably picture an image where someone was there for you, and you probably can picture some of the things you did—maybe ride your bike, play ball, or sit on a porch. The point is that you did what you chose to do. You had time to be a kid. It was your time, and it was time to be a kid.

YMCA programs offer choices. We may not be able to offer sitting on your front porch steps, but you can sit outside on some steps with a great after-school counselor who cares about you, or you can choose an enrichment activity, or arts and crafts, or play outside or inside, or to do an athletic event, or to do your homework. But the bottom line is that you have a choice.

Not all school children face success during their school day, so that more of academics might not be a way that they are successful in their after-school hours. We really need to consider what success and happiness and fulfillment is during after-school hours. It may not be more of the same—it may be for some, but it may not be. And the most important thing that we can do for children is de-

velop their self-esteem, build confidence and build them as people. That means different things to different children during their out-of-school time.

So I strongly encourage you, as you embrace legislation and grant opportunities, to look at the whole. We develop the whole child in YMCA programs. We build on the spirit, mind and body. That may seem like a coined national phrase, but let me tell you, I work it, I live it, I breathe it. It is what we do. Character development is a YMCA initiative. We teach caring, respect, honesty and responsibility, because—you are right—it is time to put values back into children's lives, and if we are the ones who are caring for them, we need to be driving that force.

More important than the activities, I need to say, are the people who give those activities and care for these children every day. As you closed your eyes and thought about your after-school time, you saw a person. Ten years from now, our 8-year-olds, or 20 years from now, our 8-year-olds or my 16-year-old, when he closes his eyes, he may see a counselor, a YMCA after-school counselor or another after-school counselor. We need to make darned sure that these folks care for children, that they are trained, that we provide resources to retain and recruit and value people who give after-school care, because they are spending lots of time with children.

Senator Jeffords, you also spoke about the out-of-school hours being so much larger than after-school hours. Children are only in school for 20 percent of their waking hours, and if you added up all the other slices of their day and the time they spent out of school and perhaps out of the home, potentially one-third of their waking hours could be in care. Now, that is frightening for the kids who do not have that care, who are home with the door locked, and it is startling for those of us who spend this amount of time with children, that it is one-third of their lives. That is a critical piece for children.

Caring for school-age children requires collaborations. Our national YMCA figures show that 85 percent of all of our after-school programs operate in public school buildings. In Burlington, VT, we operate our programs in 19 elementary schools, and I am here to tell you that we could not do it without those school facilities. So I represent both. I do a wonderful program at my downtown YMCA, which I hope would be able to apply for funding and seek resources as many YMCAs in the country, but I also partner with 19 elementary schools to provide services for about 700 children at those venues. We are partners. We see ourselves as partners, and it is rich.

Not all communities have that quality of relationship, and any legislation we could promote that could build on that is important. It is critical that these relationships be maintained and expanded.

So what can you do? I am here to tell you from Vermont—lots of things. Understanding these issues is first and foremost, and again, I feel so privileged that you are here today to listen about children and their out-of-school hours.

Providing resources to communities is the next step, and looking at the broad scope of what that means, maybe all types of school-age care in different facilities provided by high-quality folks—quality again being a measure. And we need your help to support and

build community networks and collaborations that strengthen programs for children during their out-of-school time.

It is my thought that as we maximize our resources in order to foster true collaboration, we will reach our goal of increasing the quality and quantity of school-age programs available for children. Perhaps grant moneys or other resources that entice and ensure collaboration would bring all the key players to the table, and we would work toward that common goal of quality care.

Additionally, resources to recruit, retain and develop professional staff to deliver these programs is crucial. Remember children who close their eyes 20 years from now; they will see that caregiver. We need to support that caregiver as a professional and train and value them through their salaries.

Finally, providing increased subsidies so that all families can access quality care, allowing equal opportunities for their children. Regardless of whether it is the mom in East L.A., working for minimum wage, or someone in a professional role, those children deserve equal access to high quality.

More than ever, families need help. They need help to make it. We know that kids home alone are at risk. That is a given; we know that. We know that the number of children in need of care during out-of-school time is skyrocketing. Quality school-age programs have positive effects on the development of children. It is just that simple. quality after-school programs have positive effects. And we are talking about millions of children.

Children in quality programs, it has been proven, have better peer relationships, emotional adjustments, grades and conduct in school. Quite simply, we must do it, and we must prioritize it. It builds better children who become stronger people.

In closing, I thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to share some insights on children and their needs during out-of-school time. I look forward with tremendous excitement to your work and your continued commitment and investment in our children. I know that it is a sound investment, and your dividends will pay greatly.

I thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Luck follows:]

February 23, 1998

Senator Jeffords and Committee Members:

What a privilege and honor it is to be here today. I am pleased to provide testimony regarding the needs of children in their out of school time. I bring you both the perspective of a parent of two children and that of an advocate for children and families, having worked in this field with the YMCA for the past 25 years.

It is gratifying to participate in this process today and to know that you value the words and opinion of a 16 year old, particularly gratifying is the fact that he is my son. From a parental perspective, I echo Brad's sentiment regarding teens needing resources and support. Our small community rallies and supports our kids, but more is needed. As Brad indicated, a lot can be done for a little. The type of work his group has done has been collaborative, community based and portrays prevention at it's best. I believe it is a model of the Search Institute's asset building approach to developing youth. The more assets my son and his group were given, the harder they worked and the stronger they became. As a parent, you know you can't do it alone. It takes schools, YMCAs, business leaders, corporations, and community people to each play a role in building a supportive environment for children to grow and thrive in. We are all stakeholders in the positive development of today's youth.

As associate executive director of the Greater Burlington YMCA, I oversee programs that serve over 1,200 children in child care each day. Our YMCA is the largest provider of child care in the state of Vermont. I know, first hand, the challenges families and providers face when presented with the dilemma of finding and maintaining high quality care during out of school hours.

Stepping back from Vt. a moment, the national statistics are telling. Approximately 24 million school-age children with working parents require care. Even more startling is the fact that experts estimate that nearly 5 million school-age children spend time without adult supervision each week. Research tells us that these children, who are home alone, latchkey children, are more likely to engage in risky behaviors, suffer from stress, and exhibit greater behavioral problems. Juvenile crime data reflects that peak hours for violent juvenile crimes are 3pm-8pm. After school hours have proven to be high crime hours for unsupervised children of all ages.

So, what do kids need, and how can we strengthen our work to help children be successful? Public officials, community based organizations and leaders are coming to realize the significance and critical importance of high-quality programs being available for all children during their out-of-school time.

At the YMCA, this is welcome news. Caring for children through the delivery of high-quality programs is something we have done for a long time. As the country's largest

provider of school-age care, we serve nearly 400,000 children at roughly 8,000 locations. We are committed to bringing affordable, high-quality care to American families who need it.

Quality. This word is key. In Burlington, we have built our programs around the belief that children need a safe, nurturing and welcoming program to look forward to each day. We know that an important component of a high quality after school program is that it affords children the opportunity to make choices in how they spend their after school time. These choices should include a chance to play, to create, to recreate inside or out, to do homework, to be involved in a community project or simply just "hang out" with their friends. If you think of how you spent your days after school, perhaps many images come to mind...riding a bike, climbing a tree, playing ball or sitting on your porch steps. No one defined exactly what you had to do each day and for how long. It was your time; your time to be a kid. We cannot rob today's children of that experience simply because they cannot go home after school. Our job, as providers of school age care, is to provide kids that very same opportunity; the opportunity to be a child and make choices of how to spend time and unwind after a long day at school. The menu of options should always include experiences that foster a child's social, physical, emotional, creative and intellectual growth. We believe in building children from the inside and in developing their spirit, mind, and body.

More important than the activities offered are the people with whom these children spend their days. A recent study out of the University of Wisconsin finds that the single most important piece of a high quality after school program is the quality of children's interactions with the program staff. Those of us in the field believe this, unequivocally. We know that children in our care thrive on the warmth and caring of the staff, with whom they spend so much time. Our programs go beyond making macaroni necklaces and games of kickball. We are helping children develop values, build self-esteem and establish a foundation for their future success. We are building relationships that can substantially have a positive impact on a child's life.

Working with school-age children and their families requires providing programs during all out of school times; vacations, summers, before school and during half day school closings. These are critical needs for working parents. School age children spend only 20% of their time in school. For children with one or both parents working full time outside their homes, almost 1/3 of their waking hours would be spent in child care.

Caring for school-age children requires collaborations. National YMCA figures show that 84% of all of our after school programs operate in public school buildings. Our Burlington programs operate in 19 elementary schools daily. We absolutely could not provide these services without use of the school facilities. We are seen as partners with the schools, working together to maximize the daily experiences of the children in the school. We help with scholarships, school wide projects and community related events. Our work is strengthened because we are embraced by the schools as their partner. The children and families in our programs are the benefactors of these collaborative efforts. It is critical that these relationships be maintained and expanded.

What can you do? Understanding the issues is a great start, providing resources to communities would be a wonderful next step. We need your help to support and build community networks and collaborations that strengthen programs for children during their out of school time. We must maximize our resources to in order to foster true collaboration with a goal of increasing the quality and quantity of school age options available for families. Perhaps grant monies or other resources that entice and ensure collaboration would bring all of the key community players to the table to tackle the challenge of affordable and available care. Funding can be a tremendous incentive to encourage groups to work together. True collaboration will also extend federal dollars by leveraging all possible local resources for the benefit of youth. Additionally, resources to recruit, retain, and develop professional staff to deliver these programs is crucial. Lastly, providing increased subsidy so all families could access quality care would allow equal opportunities for all children, regardless of their parent's ability to pay.

More than ever, families need help to make it. We know kids home alone are at risk. We know the number of children in need of care during out of school time is skyrocketing. Quality school age programs have positive effects on the development of children. Children in quality programs have better peer relations, emotional adjustments, grades and conduct in school. Quite simply, excellence in after school care produces benefits to children, to families, and to society. It builds better kids, who become stronger people.

Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to share some insights on children and their needs during their out of school time. I look forward, with tremendous excitement, to your continued work and investment in our children. I know it is a sound investment, and one who's dividends will be long lasting.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Luck

Sue Luck
Associate Executive Director
Greater Burlington YMCA

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Senator Wellstone, I know you have to leave. Would you like to make a comment?

Senator WELLSTONE. I told the chairman I do have to leave, but I did not want you to think it was because of lack of interest. Thank you for just superb testimony, all three of you. I think all of us take it to heart. I love your passion and your excitement and your optimism and your belief that we can make things better—and we have to.

Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Murray,

I would like to welcome you this morning. If you have a comment you would like to make now, please do.

Senator MURRAY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Unfortunately, I have to go to the floor to manage a bill, but I did want to come by, because I wanted you to know that I think this is an absolutely critical issue.

It has been excellent testimony today from all the witnesses, their perspectives on what we can do. As a mother of teenagers, I can tell you that this is one of the most stressful issues that parents deal with today.

We all worry about what our kids learn in school. We all want them to get the best education. But what really tightens our stomachs is before and after school and where they are, and if they are safe and if they are being cared for. It is an issue, no matter where you are on the income scale, whether you are in a rural or an urban community, and it is one that we must address as a Nation.

I also know this is an issue that is very important to young people, and Brad, you did an excellent job in your testimony today talking about what you have been able to do.

I know this is important to young people, because I hear it in my living room all the time, and I also hear from a lot of young people that they think we as adults do not listen to them. As a result of that frequent comment to me, I formed an organization in my State called my Student Advisory Youth Involvement Team, or SAYIT. They are developing their own political agenda, and one of their top issues is what we are doing as a nation after school to make sure they have something positive to do in their lives.

They are doing an excellent job, and I recommend to all of my colleagues forming a SAYIT group, because I think they really bring an important perspective and one that we need to listen to.

I hope that as we look to solutions, we can look at all solutions. And obviously, Brad has presented us with one where young people can get together and help put together some after-school activities that work for them. I think their voice in how that is organized is critical. I think we have an obligation to help support that as well, but I want to bring to your attention an issue that is starting to get attention in my State.

We have a group called Mothers Against Violence in America that has really focused on violence among young people and what they can do. They are coming forward with a recommendation that we start school later, and their point is very valid—our kids sleep

in. They do not get up at 6. They are not going to be out getting into trouble at 6:30 in the morning. And if we start school later, they will be finishing school later. Brad may not agree with this so much, but the fact is that we can talk about spending a lot of money on after-school care, but if we forget bus schedules and sports schedules for a while and take a look at starting school later, we will have kids in a place where they are safe and well-cared-for and paid attention to. So not all answers are expensive, and we have to look outside the box as well.

I do want to ask Brad a quick question before I go. One of the things I hear a lot from young people is that it is hard to get adults to pay attention to them. You came forward with an excellent idea, and you obviously involved your parents and community leaders. What was the biggest hurdle you had to get over in bringing all these people together?

Mr. LUCK. I think it was convincing them that we were worthwhile. As I said, there was a teen center in our community just 10 years ago, so for the community to once again rally behind and embrace another teen center and fund it and support it—it was tough for us to gather people around to support teens again doing a positive thing.

Senator MURRAY. Well, you did an excellent job, and I will take your success back to my SAYIT group and tell them to keep working, and they can do it, too. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the hearing today.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator, for those very helpful comments.

I would like to try to put things in perspective here for all of you, having listened to the first panel. I think the second panel has outlined why we have tried to direct this legislation toward helping communities to better utilize facilities and to work together to share common problems and find answers together. That is why I get somewhat irritated when I find that it has been cleverly changed to take a different direction, when it is as important as it is.

I think it is important for us to understand that there are resources out there which our society, that through convention, tradition or just failure to understand can be better utilized. Through cooperation, those facilities could be utilized to a much greater extent by all of us working together. There is no reason why schools have to close the minute the last kid leaves. They are there; it is a lot less expensive to open them up. Maybe somebody else has to pick up the tab for custodial services or whatever. But rather than build a whole new building or whatever else, it makes more sense to use the existing facilities.

This country has to reexamine a lot of structural problems that we have, not the least of which is the one we are facing to a certain extent here today. The problem is two-worker families, the amount of time that the parents are not home at all because of the obligations to provide for the family and all the other demands that we have in our society now. We have not changed our structure. There is no reason why school should end as earlier as it does, and we should change that. We should have more opportunities for young people. We should shorten the summers; it is anti-educational to

shut schools down for over 30 days because kids' learning starts dissipating and being reduced. So there are a lot of things we can do.

As I stated, it is a resource problem, and the question is how to better utilize those resources.

Brad, I want to share with you that when I was in high school, my sister and I started our teen center in Rutland, VT. I will not tell you how many years ago that was, but I guess what goes around comes around. We had a very difficult time, and finally, the Rotary Club, who had a building, opened the building up for us and provided some of the funding. It struggled on for many years and then shut down. Then we started another one, and that shut down. We have to get some continuity to these operations.

Well, you have got to straighten out my opening comment that you are "the quarterback of the basketball team."

Mr. LUCK. The quarterback of the football team.

The CHAIRMAN. OK—and you play basketball?

Mr. LUCK. And play basketball, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How is your team doing?

Mr. LUCK. Pretty good. We should be in the State finals in the next couple weeks.

Ms. LUCK. He is missing the game to be here, Senator, so we do not know. We will call home and find out.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Smith, I want to commend you for your testimony. It was very enlightening. In your testimony, you stated that "Children seek a clear direction as well as both a need and desire to have a strong parental and/or adult mentoring bond." I find that choice of words very interesting, that there is "a need and desire" for a strong adult presence. Yet on page 13 of your study, when you asked the kids to name their biggest hero, the number one answer expressed by 21 percent was "No one." "A parent" finished second, with 16 percent, and I find that kind of revealing. Are we not delivering what kids need in the sense of parental or adult leadership, or what is the answer?

Mr. SMITH. I think I agree with everybody that times are changing, and the demands on adults with respect to youth are very different than they were 30 years ago. But what we find—and maybe Brad can tell me if this is consistent with what he sees—is that young people are looking for adult role models, they are looking at adults in respect to their behavior. They do want to respect adults. Sometimes, they are not given that opportunity, and that is a shame.

To put that 20 percent in perspective, though, it means that 80 percent do have adult role models that they admire; but it is sad that one in five do not. I think that we have to encourage—what is so exciting about Sue's testimony is you see somebody who really has a vested interested in young people. There are those people out there, and we have to bring them together. That is why I think your initiatives here are so important.

The CHAIRMAN. What impact has television had on that aspect? When I was growing up, we did not—well, we had television after a while—but most of our time after dinner was spent playing games in the family. There was a lot more communication with the adults, outside activities, and so on.

Mr. SMITH. I think it is probably less of an influence than we think it is, and I say that with the exception perhaps of violence. There have been studies that show a direct correction there, but it is more of a background noise. It does not influence young people nearly as much as parental values and peer influences do, but it has some influence. I look to my expert for confirmation here.

The CHAIRMAN. What do we need to do to be better adults so that our children become better kids?

Mr. SMITH. We have to take the time to be with them more. And it is not just time, it is letting them know that we care—if we are not there, to call and check on them, to have them with someone we trust, to look at who their friends are and try to direct them into peer groups that are not going to expose them to risk behaviors. Showing that you care is really the biggest quality, I think, that a parent today can have.

Again, we have a hugely different landscape than when you and I grew up, and we have to be creative, and I think that what you are doing here is addressing present needs and needs that we are going to have even more in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. In your testimony, you mentioned the importance of character education as one of the key elements of good after-school programs. In 1994, we included as a part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act a Character Education Program which allowed communities to develop Character Education Programs within certain boundaries defined by the Act.

I supported that Act, obviously, and I agree that it is probably an important part of after-school programs; but I remember well that one of the key battles we fought in passing that particular Act was against the wariness of the Government prescribing exactly what is meant by "character." We had some real problems with that.

Mr. SMITH. Well, there are pretty much established universal principles. Sue mentioned some that the YMCA has identified. I think that each community can look at what characteristics or character elements they would like to instill in young people. And interestingly, when this process is done, having spoken to a lot of character education people, there are usually six or seven that everyone agrees with, and then other communities may add two or three, but it is not a difficult process. I mean, we all agree on a lot of the fundamental character principles.

The CHAIRMAN. Apart from adult involvement and a character development component, you list two other major ingredients which make up the recipe for successful a after-school program—clear, concise messages such as "Just say No," and flexibility at the local level. Those four ingredients are a delicate combination. How do you recommend the Federal Government strike the appropriate balance between local flexibility and the Federal oversight that is required where Federal funds are involved?

Mr. SMITH. Well, I think in respect to the Federal role, the Government receives a lot of financial resources to distribute, and rather than enlarging bureaucracies, if we can give money directly to States, and even past the State bureaucracies, to local communities, that seems to be a challenge that you face but something

that is needed, since it is the local community that really decides what programs are best in that community.

I think in respect to directed messages, we have got to be a lot clearer in what is expected of young people. I agree with what Brad said in regard to what their center has decided on—they do not need more messages that say do not do this, or do not do that. They need activities that help to both occupy their time and direct them toward positive, preventive courses.

The CHAIRMAN. How do we measure the success of these programs? Is it possible, and should it be done?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, I think there are general markets, and we are seeing them. There certainly are a lot of surveys that you are aware of that the Governments funds, showing use of alcohol, drugs, sexual activity, violence and tobacco use. So in respect to risk behaviors, there are a lot of markers.

The direction, incidentally, in most of these behaviors is very favorable today with the exception of drug use. That is an area that we have got to focus on more.

The CHAIRMAN. Brad, let me turn to you on that. How do you measure success?

Mr. LUCK. I guess our success would be our attendance rate and the general appearance and general enthusiasm for the teen center. In our teen center, I guess that is how we would measure our success.

In general, it is mainly if we can keep kids doing something productive or doing an activity, whether it be at the center or something that we sponsor somewhere else. I think it is mainly our attendance and the enthusiasm that the kids have.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you work with law enforcement people at all? What kind of relationship do you have with them?

Mr. LUCK. We are very close with our local police. Our captain of police is very involved with the teen center from the beginning. They are large supporters of the teen center. They met with us last week when Attorney General Reno came. So they are very supportive, and they have seen progress from the teen center and have seen less of kids hanging around and loitering around the local McDonalds or the local parking lots, and they have seen more kids at the teen center, so they are very supportive.

The CHAIRMAN. So do they sort of urge kids to go there?

Mr. LUCK. They do. When they see kids loitering around different places, they will mention why not go to the teen center. They also give us feedback if some kids say, "No, we do not want to go there." The officers will digest the reasons why and figure out things to help us provide more activities for a diverse group. Also, I think kids are getting along better with the police in our community. It is not so much that they are authority figures now, because it is typical for a police officer to stop in on a Friday night or to drive by the teen center or to be at one of our meetings. So it is more of a friendly relationship, "Hi, how are you?" instead of I hate to see him pull me over, or I hate to see him driving around town.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you handle alcohol? How do you handle it if a six-pack arrives at the teen center?

Mr. LUCK. Well, luckily we have not faced that problem yet, and certainly that will take on a life of its own when it does arrive. We

have rules and policies in place, and both of our directors are young teachers in their 20's. There are two of them, and they are really great at dealing with things on the spot and making good decisions for us and for the teens, and they are very supportive of our actions.

The CHAIRMAN. Another duty of this committee is in regard to teen smoking. Do you have any rules on teen smoking?

Mr. LUCK. Well, Vermont is obviously very different. If you are under 18, it is now against the law to smoke. I am not sure if that is nationwide. There is no smoking on teen center grounds, there is no smoking on public property. It is against the law now. Before, it was an issue, when we were first starting the teen center, if we had a smoking area outside, but now that it is against the law, it is not allowed anywhere.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you must feel pretty proud of Brad, Ms. Luck.

Ms. LUCK. I do feel proud, and it is again a privilege to be here with him speaking about out-of-schooltime.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to thank you for your testimony. I am a big believer in the YMCAs and the programs they have. What kind of public support is there for the program in your community?

Ms. LUCK. In Burlington, VT, we have great public support in that, as I stated, many of our programs run in elementary schools. We run these programs rent-free because our position is that we are a partner in that community; we are partners to families in that school to say what more do children and families in a South Burlington elementary school or a Williston Elementary School need. And they need good after-school care.

It is typically not the business of public education to provide after-school care. That is not their mission or potentially what they are good at. Often, other organizations are good at that. So in our community, we have built and enjoyed the pleasure of a great collaborative situation in schools where we are the partner, and we come in and provide after-school care. That is a very rich component of our program.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you arrange the after-school work? What kind of hierarchy do you have to move through, and how do you get permission to do that, and what kind of cooperation do you get?

Ms. LUCK. In elementary school?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Ms. Lucky. Often, it is a grassroots approach that starts with a PTO and a group of parents who say, "We need help in our after-school hours. What can we do?" Then, there is often a look in communities at who provides after-school care. We often come in and will give a presentation. It then moves to the level of the building principal and teachers, if there is a committee—what rooms will you need? Who will touch my scissors and markers—and understanding and being respectful of elementary school teachers, their work and their space. And you have got to build that, Senator Jeffords. It does not just happen. You have got to build that respect for their space and then build a common respect for what children need and how we can provide it. So we work from the parents to the teachers and elementary teachers, on to the school board, typically, and whatever hierarchical situation arises.

After the buy-in of all of those key stakeholders, you have what I call a collaborative and ready-to-run program, and we are ready to do that. Without that, we typically will not come in and do a program. If we are seen as a vendor or an add-on that maybe can have a little corner of a gym on Tuesdays from 2 to 2:40, and the art room on Thursdays from 4 to 4:10, but only if the art teachers is absent, that is not collaboration; that is not richness and wholeness in after-school hours. So our YMCA has been able to pride ourselves to be able to be credible and come in and say what children need and how we can provide it and where we can find the balance. But a little corner of the cafeteria does not make a collaboration. So we are experienced in building those relationships, which build programs, which build communities, which enrich the lives of children.

The CHAIRMAN. The complaint I sometimes hear from school people is we would love to have them come in, but the liability problem is too great; it is a problem. So we do not let them in because we might be liable for injuries.

Ms. LUCK. We have operated for 12 years now, at 19 locations—which, in Vermont, is a very large slice of the population—and we have not found that an issue. We carry as a rider on our insurance liability policy each and every school in which we operate, and we name them additionally insured, and they also name us additionally insured.

I understand from our carriers that that is a very minimal—zero, I have heard from our school districts—expense to them, and minimal to us. So we mutually insure each other, and that relationship has worked in Vermont. I am not familiar with other States and how it has worked.

The CHAIRMAN. I have the feeling it is more of an excuse than anything else.

Ms. LUCK. I have the feeling it may be.

The CHAIRMAN. I see a lot of heads nodding out in the audience.

Ms. LUCK. If people are willing to do the research, and I think many YMCAs will tell you—obviously, YMCAs are in 8,000 locations, 84 percent of which are in school buildings, so something is very right about those relationships, and I suspect liability is not an issue.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, thank you all very, very much. We deeply appreciate your testimony. Good luck to you, Brad, in your endeavors.

Mr. LUCK. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, Senator Murray's statement will be made a part of the record.

[The prepared statement of Senator Murray follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR MURRAY

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for holding this hearing today; there are few more important needs before us than that for quality services for children outside the hours they spend in the classroom.

I want to voice my opinion regarding Chairman Jeffords irritation about the Administration's proposed changes to the 21st Century Learning Centers. I want to add that, although it does appear

that Administration has worked with the National Community Education Association and the Mott Foundation, I think it is important for us to recognize that after school programs are vital—and so are community education programs for seniors, adults and families. Whatever we do over the next few years, we must invest in both community education and after-school programs. I want to work with Chairman Jeffords and the Department as we work out solutions for these two important and related goals.

Community education is vital. The Mott Foundation has been involved in this work for decades, and the Federal Government has become involved in recent years. I see opening the school doors, and tying communities and schools more closely together as an idea for the future.

Programs that happen outside school hours are again, critical. One such service for children and their families, is a summer program called Skagit County Best SELF. This program, in my State, provides activities and nutrition services to children and families in the community. Best SELF also provides special assistance to young children, who are especially in need—including intensive case management and home-based services, they work with school special education staff as needed.

In a forthcoming report on the effectiveness of this program, we are going to hear that since 1995, when Best SELF began identifying children at risk, and began to offer them services, there have been measurable decreases in juvenile crime. They have found that for individual students there are "before" and "after" changes, in terms of aggressive behaviors and acting out. This has, again, led to lower juvenile crime in Skagit County than other counties in the comparative study. The program was built around the Federal Summer Food Program, which I've fought to protect—but this or other funding can help communities across the country to begin Best SELF-type programs for their own children and communities.

I see the Administration's efforts to expand after school programs, and the responses proposed by Democrats and Republicans in Congress—as supportive of things like Best SELF, but we must do everything we can to strengthen the links between schools, health organizations, and a variety of community-based organizations.

One of the most important things we can do on this whole issue of what children do with their afternoons, of course, is change the school day. Research now has begun to show that while adolescent sleep patterns are a bit different from adults, children and adolescents benefit from the same work day as their parents and families. Adults typically start their workday at 8 or 9 am., and are busy until 4 or 5 or 6 p.m. There are many reasons that it makes sense to look at changing school schedules to better fit students' internal clocks—to take advantage of when they learn best. Mothers Against Violence In America and other organizations are working on educating America about this issue of scheduling—I encourage people to follow their work. We cannot allow the bus schedule or other choices made by the adults in the system to ignore the learning needs of the student. In addition, many of the problems that are created by parents and children having different schedules—after school child care, transportation problems, the phone lines

burning up as parents check on children's safety in the afternoons—many of these problems go away as the family becomes the most effective car pool on the road.

Thank you for allowing me to share a few thoughts about this important issue, and thank you to all the people who have brought us information today.

The CHAIRMAN. For our third and final panel, we bring together representatives from key players in meeting the needs of our school-age children and youth.

Arthur Sheninger is representing the National Association of Elementary School Principals. He is the principal at Hatchery Hill School in Hackettstown, NJ. Mr. Sheninger became interested in school-age child care over a decade ago. In 1989, he worked out of a cooperative arrangement with Catholic Charities to sponsor an innovative after-school program in Warren County, NJ. During the past decade, the program he developed with Catholic Charities has grown and evolved to meet the constantly changing needs of the city, families and communities of Warren County. Wow. Go ahead.

STATEMENTS OF ARTHUR W. SHENINGER, PRINCIPAL, HATCHERY HILL SCHOOL, HACKETTSTOWN, NJ, ON BEHALF OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS; LINDA CHILDEARS, PRESIDENT, YOUNG AMERICANS BANK, DENVER, CO, AND PRESIDENT, BOARD OF DIRECTORS, NATIONAL ASSEMBLY OF NATIONAL VOLUNTARY HEALTH AND SOCIAL WELFARE ORGANIZATIONS; AND THOMAS C. FRAZIER, COMMISSIONER, BALTIMORE CITY POLICY DEPARTMENT, BALTIMORE, MD, ON BEHALF OF FIGHT CRIME: INVEST IN KIDS

Mr. SHENINGER. Thank you, Senator. I represent the National Association of Elementary School Principals today.

I want to thank you for inviting me here. As you said, my name is Arthur Sheninger, and I am the principal of Hatchery Hill School in Hackettstown, NJ. I have been an elementary school principal for 24 years. I am appearing today as a principal and as a spokesperson for the National Association of Elementary School Principals, which represents 28,000 elementary and middle school principals in the United States.

I appreciate the opportunity to testify on school-age child care and ask that my written statement be included in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be.

Mr. SHENINGER. The National Association of Elementary School Principals has a longstanding interest in child care. In 1993, the Association published "Standards for Quality School-Age Child Care," undertaken in collaboration with the Wellesley College School-Age Child Care Project. I served on the review committee for that publication, and I have brought copies of the book and other materials for members of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. I have it here, just to let you know that it is being noticed.

Mr. SHENINGER. Thank you.

NAESP members are overwhelmingly in favor of supervision of children before and after school. In a 1988 survey of 1,175 principals, two-thirds of the respondents said public schools should be

involved in child care. A 1993 study by the U.S. Department of Education estimated that 1.7 million children in grades kindergarten through 8 were in 49,500 extended-day programs. About one-third of these programs were located in public schools, although not necessarily administered by them.

Examples of public school programs include those that contain a high academic component, emphasize coordinated services, or combined donated or rented school facilities with community agency administration.

Schools need not be the providers of the child care, but they should work with parents and the community in support of quality child care. NAESP does not support using existing Federal education funds for child care, but we would welcome the availability of other Federal funding designated for child care.

There are several characteristics that must be present in order for child care to meet the needs of families. NEASP has identified some essential steps in designing a program, along with 19 standards of excellence.

It is important to build a partnership that has strong leadership, clear goals and an action plan. An assessment of needs and current resources should be conducted. Funding must be identified and rules communicated. Decisions should be made about scholarships, a sliding scale, or other fee options. The community must make sure that parents can and will participate in the program.

Who is best to administer the program? It may or may not be the school. That decision should rest with the principal. Other considerations involve location and the use of the space and its contents. There should be a formalized relationship between the school and the program. Teachers and child care workers should know each other. This will help clarify roles and responsibilities. The space, whether a school or other side, should be clean, adequate in size and well-equipped.

Several of NAESP's standards address relationships. Staff members must relate well to children, and child-to-staff ratios should be small. The staff must also form partnerships as a staff and with the children's families. Programs should provide a wide variety of activities. Sometimes children need a lot of physical activity; at other times, they want to express themselves through the arts, or learn new facts and skills. It is also important to provide sufficient supplies and equipment to support the development of the children's creativity and their social, cognitive and motor skills.

Program administration should be undertaken with care and attention to detail. In a school, is the space to be donated or rented? Who is accountable and liable? What about the use of equipment and materials? Such agreements need to be spelled out in writing.

Now I would like to tell you about my school's program. I have been active, as you have indicated, since 1988. In Hackettstown, we also have another program that we call "First Contact." The purpose of First Contact is when people move into our community, we want to make them feel at home, so we give them a pamphlet with information, including a number of materials. It includes things like bus schedules, train schedules, lists of social agencies, and we also include a list of all the child care providers in the area, including the ones that are housed in our schools. We feel it is important

that parents have this information. So one thing that we can do right up front is to let parents know and make them aware of what opportunities there are out there for child care.

The decision about housing a child care program in a school needs to be made at the local level. Each school is unique, and that is important to keep in mind. In 1988, when I first became involved, I did not feel that I had the expertise or the time to establish a program in my own school; but with the support of our board of education, in 1989, we entered into an agreement with Catholic Charities, a social service agency, allowing them to use our facilities to offer an after-school program. Our district provides free use of rooms, equipment and in-kind services such as custodial services, use of equipment.

Catholic Charities, on the other hand, is responsible for staffing and all administration, including liability insurance. We do have a memorandum of understanding that spells out what our requirements are and what theirs are.

A sliding fee scale is utilized ranging from $76 to $148 per month per child, and this is from 3 to 6 care. Our program was the first such endeavor in our county, and since that time, eight other programs have been established.

In the summer of 1990, we expanded the services to include a summer child care program. Last year, we instituted a before-school breakfast program. So when I was listening to Assistant Secretary Tirozzi's comments about schools being open, our schools are open from 7:45 in the morning until about 10 o'clock at night with activities—and that is not uncommon in schools. It is not a unique situation. Each school has to make the decision as to what they can and cannot do, and a number of variables apply here.

The CHAIRMAN. That is in your district or for the whole State?

Mr. SHENINGER. That is our district. But I would clarify that I know there are schools across the country that do this. I have talked to people at national principals' conventions, and the committee that I served on had representatives from all over the country, and there are schools all across the country that are doing things like this.

What can the Federal Government do? The Federal Government can do two things, I think. First, you can encourage school districts, social service agencies, and businesses to join forces to establish sites. I was pleased to hear Ms. Luck's ideas and the things she mentioned about the program that they are involved in, because it is very similar to ours. So it can be done with that type of collaborative effort.

It is important that you advertise and publish success stories. Let people out there know that these programs can work, and they do work.

Financial incentives can also help with start-up costs or help to subsidize low-income clients. However, I encourage you not to divert funding that is currently allocated to education for these incentives.

Every dollar of State and Federal funds is critical, and it is critical to us to maintain services and programs in schools.

Thank you, Senator. I would be happy to answer questions you may have.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you for very helpful testimony.
[The prepared statement of Mr. Sheninger follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ARTHUR W. SHENINGER

Good morning, Chairman Jeffords, Senator Kennedy, and members of the committee. My name is Arthur Sheninger, and I am the principal of the Hatchery Hill School in Hackettstown, New Jersey. I am appearing today both in my capacity as a principal and as a spokesperson for the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), which represents nearly 28,000 elementary and middle school principals. I appreciate the opportunity to testify on the important topic of school-age child care, and I ask that my written statement be submitted for the hearing record.

I am pleased that the committee is holding this hearing, because child care is a major concern in our nation. As a principal, I am well aware of the struggles of families to find quality, affordable child care in a setting that is safe and stimulating for children. My remarks will focus on child care for school-age children before and after school.

The National Association of Elementary School Principals has a longstanding interest in child care. This interest was exhibited in the Association's 1993 publication, Standards for Quality School-Age Child Care, a project undertaken in collaboration with the Wellesley College School-Age Child Care Project. I had the pleasure of serving on the review committee for that publication, the second edition of which is to be completed this year. Many of our state affiliates have hosted workshops for school-community teams interested in establishing child care programs.

NAESP members are overwhelmingly in favor of supervision of children before and after school. In a 1988 survey of 1,175 principals, NAESP found that two-thirds of the respondents felt that public schools should be involved in child care. A 1993 study by the U.S. Department of Education estimates that 1.7 million children in grades Kindergarten through 8 were enrolled in 49,500 extended-day programs. Approximately one-third of these programs were located in public schools, though not necessarily administered by them. Public school involvement in child care may take any of a number of forms. Some of the many examples include programs that extend the school day and contain a high academic component, programs emphasizing coordinated services by the school and community agencies, or arrangements whereby the school facilities are rented or donated as an in-kind contribution to a program that is staffed and run by one or more community agencies. It is important to be aware that each school and community is unique, and the level of school involvement in child care will vary among communities. Schools need not be the providers of child care, but it is important for schools to work with parents and the community in support of quality child care programs. NAESP does not support the diversion of Federal education funds to child care programs, but we would welcome the availability of other Federal funding that is specifically designated for child care.

Regardless of the structure of the program, there are a number of characteristics that must be present in order for a school-age child care program to meet the needs of children and families. NAESP has identified a number of essential steps to take in designing a school-age child care program, along with 19 "standards of excellence" for providing safe and stimulating environments for 5- to 13-year-old children when school is out and their parents are not present.

It is important, first, to build a partnership of the stakeholders. The partnership needs to have strong leadership, clear goals, and an action plan. A needs assessment should be conducted to determine the existing resources and needs for a child care program. Funding availability must be determined and rules clearly communicated. The fees for participation should be set, with decisions made about possible stipends, scholarships, a sliding scale, or other fee options. The community must make sure that parents will participate in and can afford the planned program. In designing the program, it is important to decide who is best to administer it. It may or may not be the school, and that decision should rest with the principal. Other design considerations include program location and agreements regarding the use of the space and its contents. Space is one of the critical elements for schools, especially now as the elementary and secondary school population escalates. The ideal for a school-based program is to have a separate area allocated for the child care program, as teachers and staff are often wary of having their classrooms or offices used for child care.

If the program is in a school, one of NAESP's standards of excellence calls for the school to formalize its relationship with the program. Teachers and child care workers should know each other and work together whenever possible. This will help to

ensure sound communication and clarify policies, roles, and responsibilities to benefit the children served.

The space chosen to house the program, whether a school or other site, should be clean, well organized, adequate in size, and equipped with a variety of materials, supplies, and equipment. Regarding size, NAESP recommends at least 35 square feet per child inside and at least 75 square feet per child outside.

Within the realm of human relationships, there are a number of standards on the NAESP list. The staff members of any child care program must relate well to children—demonstrating warmth and respect and actively promoting children's development and self-esteem. This is best accomplished when child-to-staff ratios are small. The staff must also be able to form partnerships as a staff and with the children's families. This calls for clear and frequent communication, goal setting, and problem solving.

The program should provide a wide variety of activities and settings for the children. Sometimes children need a lot of physical activity, to blow off steam and feel their own strength. At other times, they may want to express themselves through the visual or performing arts or learn new facts and skills. Opportunities for quiet and solitude should be available, as should group activities. It is also important to provide sufficient supplies and equipment to support the development of the children's large and small motor skills, cognitive skills, creativity, and social skills.

Program administration is obviously a great responsibility, and those undertaking such a task must enter into it with care and attention to detail. When the child care program is to be located in a school, is the space to be donated or rented? Who is accountable and liable and who is to serve as the fiscal agent? What about the use of the school's equipment and materials? Such agreements need to be clearly spelled out in writing, as in a contract, lease, or memorandum of understanding.

Now I'd like to tell you about the program at my school. I first became interested in school-age child care in 1988. Since that time I have attended several workshops and seminars and have been involved in establishing programs. One way schools can assist parents in finding after-school care and activities in, serving as a resource and providing information. In Hackettstown we have a program entitled First Contact. When parents register their children we provide them with a packet of materials to help acquaint them with the community.

As has been mentioned, school districts can also assist in meeting the critical need for child care by allowing schools to be utilized as child care facilities. This can be done either through an in-house program sponsored by the school district or through a cooperative arrangement with an outside agency. This decision needs to be determined at the local level. I did not feel I had the expertise or the time to establish a program on my own in my school. I also did not want to burden taxpayers with the cost of supporting an after-school program. With the support of our Board of Education, in 1989 we entered an arrangement with Catholic Charities, a social service agency in our county, allowing them to use our facilities to offer an after-school child care program. The district provides free use of rooms in the school id in-kind services, such as cleaning and use of equipment. Catholic Charities is responsible for staffing, ,management, supervision, liability insurance, and all financial aspects of the program. A sliding fee scale is currently utilized ranging from $76.00 to $148.00 per month per child. By offering free use of the facilities and in-kind services, we enable the agency to maintain lower operating costs and provide a much-needed service to the community. The Hackettstown program was the first such endeavor in our county. Since its inception, eight other programs have been established.

In the summer of 1990 we decided to expand the services to include a summer child care program. This program operates Monday through Friday from 7:30 am. to 6:00 p.m. Students participate in a number of activities, including supervised recreation, PTA enrichment classes, field trips, and swimming at the community pool. Fees are also based on a sliding scale.

Last year, as part of the National School Lunch Program, we instituted a before-school breakfast program. Parents now have the option of having their children arrive at school at 7:45 am. and remain in the child care program until 6:00 pm.

The Federal Government can assist in establishing child care programs by encouraging school districts, social service agencies, and businesses to join forces to establish sites. This can be accomplished by publishing success stories, highlighting the benefits to be derived from these alliances. Financial incentives can also be offered by the government to underwrite start-up costs of subsidize low-income clients. However, I encourage you not to divert funding currently allocated to education to provide these incentives. Every dollar of State and Federal funds is critical to the maintenance of services and programs in schools. With your assistance, schools can play a critical role in meeting the after-school child care needs of children.

Thank you again for this opportunity to testify. I will be happy to answer any questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Ms. Linda Childears is the president and chief operating officer of Young Americans Bank and the Young Americans Education Foundation in Denver, CO. I am very familiar with your activities there. These two entities focus on the economic education of young people so they will be competent and knowledgeable in managing their financial affairs.

The Young Americans Bank is exclusively for young people under 22 years of age. Through using the bank's services, young people learn the proper use of bank services and personal financial responsibility. The Foundation provides a variety of educational activities for young people, which provide hands-on lessons in free enterprise entrepreneurism and financial investment.

Ms. Childears currently serves as president of the board of the National Assembly, a coalition of 52 major voluntary health and human services organizations in the United States. She is here representing the National Assembly.

Ms. Childears is also past president of the National Campfire Boys and Girls.

You have been doing a good job in a lot of places. Please proceed.

Ms. CHILDEARS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am delighted to be here with you today to discuss the role of community-based organizations in meeting the needs of our children in nonschool hours.

As you mentioned, the National Assembly, which was founded in 1923, represents 54—actually, my bio needs updating—of the Nation's leading national health and human services organizations.

The National Assembly has an affinity group called the National Collaboration for Youth, which has 22 of our members involved, and they are all organizations which serve youth. It was organized in 1973, and it has become a major voice for positive youth development, especially in the out-of-school hours. Members of the Collaboration for Youth are among the Nation's largest providers of nonschool care. Collectively, National Collaboration members service more than 40 million American children and youth each year, involving more than 5 million volunteers. YMCA alone, which you have heard a lot about today, through 2,200 local affiliates, serves more than 7.5 million youngsters.

Add to these programs other providers, like Camp Fire, 4-H, Boys and Girls Clubs, Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, and you begin to get a picture of the out-of-school reach of private, community-based organizations in America and the children they serve.

Our programs vary from site to site in order to meet more appropriately the needs of the various communities. they include such things as mentoring, camps, sports, leadership development, community service and other youth development strategies.

Mr. Chairman, your use of the term "nonschool hours" in describing the subject of today's hearing is most appropriate. Too often when we speak of school-age care, we limit the discussion to after-school care. This simply leads to solutions that are limited, and keeping schools open a few extra hours, as we have been talking about this morning, does not always answer everything we need.

While this is an initiative that we applaud, it is important to note that the needs of school-age children and their parents go beyond the end of the day or the normal work day.

Community-based programs such as those represented by the National Collaboration for Youth provide development services after school, on weekends, during the summer, and during the vacation periods. Private community-based organizations are in place and are in the business of youth development. When it comes to school-age care, we are an important part of the solution, and we appreciate very much being included in the equation during this committee's deliberations.

I should note that the National Collaboration agencies are well aware of the attention of this committee and of its chairman to the needs of school-age youth and working families. We know that your bill, S. 1037, the CIDCARE Act, was one of the first child care bills introduced during this Congress, and we know of your longstanding commitment over the years. You and your staff are to be commended for your quest for quality in developing a workable, community-based, locally-driven approach to providing developmentally appropriate activities for young people when school is not in session.

Others have followed your lead, including the President, with this proposal for a $21 billion child care initiative. The recent emphasis on child care issues has in fact led the Congressional Quarterly to recently suggest that it is not whether child care legislation will be approved during this Congress, but how.

Regarding child care legislation in general, the National Collaboration's advocacy with the Congress and the White House has been twofold—do not forget the needs of school-age children, and do not forget the importance of private, community-based organizations as service providers.

By the simple act of convening this hearing, it is clear that the committee already understands. I would like to spend the balance of my time discussing the barriers that our organizations face. We might list them as seven items: 1) attitudes about the need for and value of school-age care; 2) the lack of true partnerships with public schools; 3) the need for facilities; 4) the burden of start-up costs; 5) the need for transportational access; 6) the affordability for those who might benefit most from school-age care; and 7) resources for training paid staff and volunteers.

Legislation should be about more than simply starting new programs. Rather, it should encourage work with programs that already exist. What we need most is the "glue" money that strings the existing program services together, rather than having programs operate in isolation with parents left to sort out those loose strands on their own. Some parents, when faced with that alternative, simply give up and leave some 5 million school-age children at home and at risk.

Regarding the first barrier, attitudes about the need for and quality of school-age care, let me say that too frequently, the Nation thinks of child care as a custodial problem rather than a developmental opportunity. This is especially true of school-age care. We need safe places for children and youth, but we also need positive activities which promote growth. To simply corral young people in

facilities without quality programs and trained staff, providing little more than babysitting services, misses an opportunity that this Nation can ill afford.

In Federal legislation, we have begun to talk about the importance of child development. It is important that we now talk about youth development with the same urgency. One way to do this would be to establish rewards and incentives for adherence to recognized standards of quality such as those developed by the National School-Age Care Alliance and other accrediting bodies.

The second barrier is lack of true partnerships with schools. Although talk of collaboration between community-based organizations and public schools is not new, without care, the collaboration can begin to look like representation on an advisory committee.

What children and youth need in nonschool hours is a true multiprogram delivery system with a variety of agencies and programs subcontracting to provide activities and experiences based on their particular areas of expertise and available resources. This is more than just a seat at the table. It means real partnerships and new ways of operating in many of our communities.

Legislation could help by increasing the ability of community schools and their partners to access Federal dollars to help underwrite costs, including programs like Safe and Drug-Free Schools, Title I, and school lunch programs.

The third barrier is need for facilities. Non-school programs require flexible space which allows for program structure and contains adequate equipment to provide both mental and physical stimulation and skill development. Resources are needed for renovation. The addition of summer programs may require air conditioning. Access is needed to cooking facilities to provide snacks and meals for full-time programs. Renovation is important, since sometimes local health and fire code regulations are necessary to operate school-age programs.

Legislation should take into account the cost of providing suitable sites for nonschool care when school is not in session. Incentives for schools to open their facilities to community-based organizations during nonschool times, including summers, might be one way to accomplish this.

The fourth barrier concerns the burden of start-up costs. Costs related to basic start-up supplies like furniture, storage carts, books, games, computer, and recreational equipment can be high. Some kind of dedicated funding mechanism would be helpful.

Need for transportational access is the fifth barrier. Rural and low-income communities are particularly troubled by this barrier. Families needing out-of-school care are most affected. Who will transport children to and from the school? Who will get children back home?

The sixth barrier is affordability to those who might benefit most from school-age care. Much school-age care is fee-based. For example, Camp Fire Councils provide services for a sliding scale fee, with partial or full scholarships provided out of United Way funds or other nonpublic sources. To serve more kids whose parents cannot afford to pay, additional resources must be brought to bear.

Resources for training paid staff and volunteers is the last barrier. Well-trained staff and volunteers are key to the quality of any

program. But parent education requires resources, and parents are involved. With regard to training of paid staff, Congress might consider providing scholarships to enable them to receive ongoing training. Staff for nonschool programs require specialized training to meet the developmental needs of older children. This training is sometimes scarce and makes finding staff with appropriate credentials difficult.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my remarks, and I would be happy to entertain questions you or committee members may have. Let me note that in the last few years, we have spoken often about how it takes a village to raise a child. Perhaps it is time that we focus instead on what it takes to raise a village. The National Assembly and its Collaboration for Youth are glad that this committee has not forgotten that it takes a healthy child to raise that village and to sustain a national democracy.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Childears follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF LINDA CHILDEARS

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: My name is Linda Childears and I am President of the Board of the National Assembly of National Voluntary Health and Social Welfare Organizations. I am delighted to appear today to discuss the role of community-based organizations in meeting the needs of our children in the non-school hours. The National Assembly, founded in 1923, represents 54 of this Nation's leading national health and human service charities. In another volunteer capacity, I have served as the National President of Camp Fire Boys and Girls, which is a member of the National Assembly ad its affinity group, the National Collaboration for Youth. In my day-to-day professional life, I am the President of the Young America's Bank in Denver, Colorado, which is the Nation's only bank for children and youth. The bank serves youngsters in all 50 States. The National Assembly depends primarily on the dues of its members for its support and receives no Federal funds.

The Assembly's National Collaboration for Youth is a coalition of twenty-two of the Nation's most active national youth serving organizations. Organized in 1973, the NCY has become a major voice for positive youth development, especially in the out-of-school hours. Members of the Collaboration for Youth are among the Nation's largest providers of non-schoolcare. Collectively, NCY members provide services to more than 40 million American children and youth each year, involving more than five million volunteers. The YMCA alone, for example, through its 2,200 affiliates, serves more than 7.5 million youngsters. Add to these programs other community-based providers of other out-of-school care like the YWCA, Camp Fire, 4–H, Boys & Girls Clubs, the Boys Scouts, and the Girl Scouts, and you begin to get a picture of the out-of-school reach of private, community-based organizations in providing care of America's children and youth. Our programs vary from site to site in order to meet more appropriately the needs of their communities. They include mentoring, camps, sports, leadership development, community service and other youth development strategies.

Mr. Chairman, your use of the term non-school hours in describing the subject of today's hearing is most appropriate. Too often, when we speak of school-age care, we limit the scope of our discussion to "after-school" care. This sometimes leads to solutions which are limited to simply keeping schools open for an extra three or four hours on the days they are open. While this is an initiative we applaud, it is important to note that the needs of our school-age children and their parents do not end at dusk on school days. Community-based programs such as those represented by the National Collaboration for Youth provide development services after school, on weekends, during the summer, and during school vacation periods as well. Private voluntary community-based organizations are in place and in the business of youth development. When it comes to school-age care, we are an important part of the solution and we appreciate being included in the equation during this committee's deliberations.

I should note that NCY agencies are well aware of the attention of this committee and its chairman to the needs of school-age youth and working families. Mr. Chair-

man, we know that your bill, S. 1037, the CIDCARE Act, was one of the first child care bills introduced during this Congress and we know of your commitment over the years. You and your staff are to be commended for your "quest for quality" in developing a workable, community-based, locally-driven approach to providing developmentally appropriate activities for young people when school is not in session.

Others have followed your lead, including the President with his proposal for a $21 billion child care initiative. The recent emphasis on child care issues has, in fact, led the *Congressional Quarterly* to recently suggest that it is not whether child care legislation will be approved during this Congress but how. Regarding child care legislation in general, the NCY's advocacy with the Congress and the White House has been twofold: do not forget the needs of school-age children and do not forget the importance of private community-based organizations as service providers. By the simple act of convening this hearing, it is clear that this committee already understands. With that in mind, I would like to spend my time this morning discussing barriers faced by community-based organizations that might be addressed by legislation.

The barriers we face might be listed succinctly as: 1) attitudes about the need for and value of school-age care; 2) lack of true partnerships with public schools; 3) need for facilities; 4) the burden of start-up costs; 5) need for transportational access; 6) affordability for those who might benefit most from school-age care; and 7) resources for training paid staff and volunteers. I hope that the Congress can transform these so-called "barriers" into a sort of "Seven Opportunities for Highly Effective Child Care Legislation." Legislation should be about more than simply starting new programs. Rather, it should encourage work with programs that already exist. What we need most is "glue" money to string existing services together, rather than having programs operate in isolation with parents left to sort out the loose strands own their own. Some parents, when faced with that alternative, simply give up and leave some five million school-age latch-key children at home and at-risk.

Regarding the first barrier, Attitudes about the Need for and Quality of School-Age Care, let me say that too frequently, the nation thinks of child care as a custodial problem instead of a developmental opportunity. This is especially true of school-age care. We need safe places for children and youth, but we also need positive activities which promote growth. To simply corral young people in facilities without quality programs and trained staff, providing little more than baby-sitting services, misses an opportunity that this nation can ill-afford. In Federal legislation, we have begun to talk about the importance of child development. It is important that we begin to talk about youth development with the same urgency. One way to do this would be to establish rewards and incentives for adherence to recognized standards of quality, such as those developed by the National School-Age Care Alliance and other accrediting bodies.

The second barrier is Lack of True Partnerships with Public Schools. Though talk of collaboration between community-based organizations and public schools is not new, without care, that collaboration can begin to look only like representation on an advisory committee. What children and youth need in the non-school hours is a true multi-program delivery system, with a variety of agencies and programs subcontracting to provide activities and experiences based on their particular areas of expertise and available resources. This is more than just a seat at the table. It means real partnerships and new ways of operating.

Where community-based organizations share space in schools to provide on-site, after-school care, several questions must be answered. For example, which rooms are open to service providers and which are not? Often, important spaces like cafeterias and gyms are not available for after-school care. In an ideal situation, space would be specifically dedicated to non-school programs and consistently available. But many community-based programs must settle for limited space with many restrictions. They risk being "bumped" without notice if the school has other activities that require the use of that space.

There is more to establishing a community school than simply leaving facilities open longer. Schools need to be seen as "owned" by the community instead of "owned" by the local school system, with community partners being treated as tenants. Many schools charge a fee to outside providers for using school facilities. Community organizations must subtract such fees from monies available for programs. Legislation could help by increasing the ability of community schools and their partners to access existing Federal dollars to help underwrite costs, including programs such as Safe and Drug Free Schools, Title I, and school lunch programs.

The third barrier is the Need for Facilities. Non-school programs require flexible space which allows for program structure and contains adequate equipment to provide both mental and physical stimulation and skill development. Resources are needed for renovation. The addition of summer programs may require air condi-

tioning. Access to cooking facilities is needed to provide snacks and meals as needed in the program time-frame. Access to outdoor facilities is needed for recreation activities.

Renovation is also important since sometimes local health and fire code regulations necessary to operate a school-age program after school may be different from the ones required during the traditional school day. In those instances, community-based programs must make expensive alterations before beginning the program. One has to wonder why the school facility is safe for children during the school day, but not safe for the same children, in the same facility, after school when there are fewer children and a much higher adult/child ratio.

Occupancy funds must be available to pay for facility costs and upkeep, including utilities and janitorial services. Custodians sometimes charge community-based programs a fee beyond the aforementioned school access fee. Some programs have faced situations in which custodians cave simply refused to be available. Custodial fees can be expensive and further limit the operation of non-school programs, particularly when the required custodians are not available during school vacations, conferences, or during teacher in-service days, when schools are typically closed. Legislation should take into account the cost of providing suitable sites for non-school care when school is not in session. Incentives for schools to open their facilities to community-based organizations during non-school times, including summers, might be one way to accomplish this.

The fourth barrier concerns The Burden of Start-Up Costs. Costs related to basic start-up supplies like furniture, storage carts, books, games, computers, and recreational equipment can be high. Some kind of dedicated funding mechanism would be helpful. As mentioned, there are also a number of fees that must be paid prior to the operation of school-age programs by community-based agencies, including zoning, licensing, and health and fire department inspections. Such fees can be burdensome to the point of decreasing the size and scope of programs or even discouraging new starts altogether.

The Need for Transportational Access is the fifth barrier. Rural and low-income communities are particularly troubled by this barrier. Families most needing out-of-school care are most affected. Who will transport children from their schools to an off-site program? How will kids get home or back to school after an off-site program? How will Kids take advantage of air-school programs if their parents do not have cars? Legislation needs to include funds to be used for transportation, perhaps also providing incentives for schools that agree to use their buses to provide flexible service.

The sixth barrier is Affordability for Those Who Might Benefit Most from School-Age Care. Much school-age care is fee-based. For example, Camp Fire Councils provide services for a sliding-scale fee, with partial or full scholarships provided out of United Way funds or other non-public sources. To serve more kids whose parents cannot afford to pay, additional resources must be brought to bear. This barrier is heightened by the fact that welfare reform legislation does not guarantee subsidies for school—age children, nor provide waivers for parents who cannot find care for their school-age kids. As a result, many parents simply allow their kids to be home alone. When subsidized care is available, the paperwork involved is extremely lengthy, discouraging many parents from applying. One solution would be to increase funding dedicated to school-age programs in the Child Care Development Block Grant so more low-income families can be served.

Resonrces for Training Paid Staff and Volunteers is the last barrier. Well-trained staff and volunteers are key to quality out-of-school programs. I should emphasize that many volunteers in community-based programs are parents. But parent education requires resources. With regard to training for paid staff, Congress might consider providing scholarships to enable them to receive ongoing training. Staffs for non-school programs require specialized training to meet the developmental needs of older children. This training is sometimes scarce and makes finding staff with appropriate credentials difficult. At present, most universities do not offer classes on school-age care. Training costs are intensified when staff retention is difficult to maintain as is often the case, given the challenging, nontraditional, split-shift hours and low wages associated with school-age care. The YMCA, for example, has reported that issues related to lack of training, split-shift work hours, and compensation all work together to make recruiting school-age staff difficult.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my remarks and I will be happy to entertain my questions you or the committee may have. Let me note that in the last few years we have spoken often about how it takes a village to raise a child. Perhaps it is time that we focus instead on what it takes to raise a village. The National Assembly and its National Collaboration for Youth are glad that this committee has not

forgotten that it takes a healthy child to raise that village and to sustain a national democracy.

The CHAIRMAN. Our final witness is Thomas Frazier, who has been commissioner of the Baltimore City Police Department since 1994. Before coming to Baltimore, Commissioner Frazier was a member of the San Jose Police Department in California, where he rose through the ranks, commanding every bureau within the department. He was instrumental in designing and implementing community-oriented policing in San Jose.

Through his work in community policing, Mr. Frazier has gained invaluable experience in building community partnerships and assessing the needs of the community. Today, he is here representing Fight Crime: Invest in Kids. Fight Crime: Invest in Kids is a national organization which brings together law enforcement, crime victims and prosecutors, who believe that the best form of crime prevention is to invest our time, energy and money in our Nation's children and youth before they commit a crime. Its focus is on primary prevention through early intervention in youth development. I agree with you 100 percent, so go right ahead—convince me some more.

Mr. FRAZIER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me say that those of us in law enforcement really appreciate this opportunity. I suppose the advantage of going last is that you get to hear what everybody else has to say. The disadvantage is that a lot of it has been said before, but I think the positive aspect is that the voice that law enforcement brings to the child care discussion is very much in agreement with the other service providers.

Let me walk through a little bit of my experience, and I speak very confidently for the major city police chiefs who, in a conference a week ago, endorsed the position that child care, early child care, before-school care and after- school care, are really key to crime prevention. We are on the receiving end of why did the crime rate go up, and we are in a multifaceted system that many, many other players have a lot to do with what happens, so we really do have a huge interest in before, during, and after-school programs.

There are some things that we know for sure. We know that crime triples in the hour after school lets out. We know that half of juvenile crime occurs between 3 and 8 p.m. I know from my health department that the most frequent hour for a teenage girl to get pregnant is 4:30 in the afternoon. We know that we have kids who are desperate for places to go—and we have heard safe spaces and positive alternatives and good role models a number of time today.

Let me paint the picture of a postindustrial city. Twenty-5 years ago when Baltimore was fully employed, and 925,000 people lived in the city, we had an industrial economy. In an industrial economy, you have a jobs pyramid. You have your well-educated managerial at the top, union and manufacturing jobs in the middle, and service sector jobs at the bottom. As right-sizing, downsizing and all of those things occur, your socioeconomics change. If you are computer-literate and well-educated, there are more jobs for you at the top. The union and manufacturing jobs are severely diminished. There are more service sector jobs at the bottom. Our jobs pyramid is turned into a jobs hourglass. For a police chief, that is

a recipe for civil disorder. Our middle class is gone, we are stratified economically, and we are in the position of having to deliver positive law enforcement service. There has to be something there for everybody, and we have in our city neighborhoods that are several distressed, and frankly, in a lot of places, the ability for service providers to deliver good, solid programming is very, very difficult.

In the City of Baltimore, I have taken 27 what used to be recreation centers and created Police Athletic League facilities. Now, there are some things that are important. In some of these neighborhoods, we literally had to kick drug gangs out of those centers. They had turned into recreation facilities for drug distribution organizations. The parks had been taken over.

I heard about East L.A. in earlier testimony and the woman who cried because her child could not go to a public space. When you talk about community policing, you have to talk about re-taking public spaces and using our governmental spaces as institutional anchors for neighborhoods. That is exactly what we had to do. We had to go into public spaces and re-take them and say we are going to be the service provider in these neighborhoods.

We looked at neighborhoods by Census tract that sent the highest proportion of kids to the youth authority, the most difficult neighborhoods for anyone to provide after-school services. We know that we have to provide services for kids ages 7 to 17. That is our population that is at risk. At the older end of that are our offenders. Those are the kids who need an opportunity to make good life decisions.

We know that we have to provide services from 2 in the afternoon until 10 at night. I would love to see schools go until 4 o'clock, and we would run PAL centers from 4 until midnight. Then we would have a safe space with positive activities and good role models; we would put our very best men and women police officers in there to be the role models for these kids.

Now, what has the result of that been? In our center that has been the center in operation for the longest, about 2-1/2 years now, the kids' grade-point average went from 66 to 81, crime in that neighborhood went down 42 percent the first year—and you cannot go down 42 percent every year—but it is holding in the 30s. That neighborhood has become a neighborhood of choice. It has 2,200 apartment units. People want to live in those apartments because they have a safe place for their kids to go and engage in positive activities with good role models.

When you talk to the private sector and ask what is your occupancy and what is the average length of tenancy and all the things they measure their business by, it is absolutely clear that an institutional anchor and good programming makes good economic sense and good sense for the viability of the city.

Our problem is that in a center like that one—that one has about 120 kids a day, and we have 27 centers—we have 105,000 kids in our school system. We do not have the ability or the resources to reach the number of kids that we should reach.

I think what it comes down to is what can the Congress do and what is the responsibility of Government. I think the responsibility of Government is to provide for the public safety; it is to provide for the public safety not only of kids at risk, but all of those—when

I talk about harm reduction, I am not talking about the addicts, I am talking about harm reduction to all those who are victims of the activity that kids who grow up to make wrong decisions get involved in.

So in our city, what we need to do is to go to the places that are in distress, and Baltimore, like any other city, has lots and lots of different neighborhoods with varying levels of stability and economic vitality. We are good partners. We work every day with the YMCA, the Boys and Girls Clubs. There are a lot of places in town where Boys and Girls Clubs and YMCAs operate programs by themselves, but there are a lot of places where we have to do it, because frankly, the neighborhoods are so troubled that only the police department can keep a program open at night.

What can the Congress do? I would very much appreciate consideration of funding through local collaboratives. If I want to collaborate with the YMCA or with Camp Fire Girls or Boys and Girls Clubs, I would like to see a funding stream where that is possible. I am not convinced that the funding needs to come through education. It could come through Justice, like the COP grants, on single-page applications, so there is no administrative skim at the State level.

Nutrition is a big issue for us. If we are going to run programs from 2 to 10—there are school breakfasts and school lunches—there is no ability to provide an evening nutrition program, so that would be very much appreciated.

But I think the key is to congressionally recognize that those of us who are in law enforcement very much see chile care programs as effective prevention. We are very much willing and want to be good partners in our communities, and we would very much like to see direct application to Federal funding for all the reasons that my copanelists have stated before.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Frazier follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THOMAS C. FRAZIER, ON BEHALF OF FIGHT CRIME: INVEST IN KIDS

My name is Thomas C. Frazier, and I am the Commissioner of Police in Baltimore, MD. I speak today on behalf of FIGHT CRIME: INVEST IN KIDS, a national anti-crime organization led by police, prosecutors and crime survivors. From communities large and small across the United States, we crime fighters and victims have come together to tell the American people the truth about crime: that the most powerful weapons in our anti-crime arsenal are the programs that help all kids get the right start: quality child care for preschoolers, and after-school programs to give school-age kids give kids positive alternatives to the street during the after-school hours—hours which more than 5 million children now spend unsupervised and vulnerable to the negative influences of gangs, drugs and crime.

1My officers and I struggle every day to see that dangerous criminals are behind bars. But it would be tragic if the American people were fooled into believing that we could win the war against crime with more police and more prisons alone. Until we start making the proven, effective investments that give vulnerable kids the values and responsibility to turn away from crime, we will all be running faster and faster on a treadmill of past practices.

Schoolage child and youth development programs—including after-school, weekend and summer programs—are *proven* to dramatically reduce the after-school spike in juvenile crime, and they're proven to give kids the armor of values and skills that can help them steer clear of criminal behavior today and tomorrow. It is time for America to make sure every child—and especially our most at-risk—have access to quality after-school programs that can steer them clear of crime and help them grow up to be the good neighbors and responsible citizens we all want them to be.

AFTER-SCHOOL IS PRIME TIME FOR JUVENILE CRIME

FBI data show us that the peak hours for violent juvenile crime are from 3:00 pm. to 8:00 pm. In the hour after the school bell rings, juvenile crime suddenly *trippies* and prime time for juvenile crime begins. Nearly half of all violent juvenile crime occurs between 2:00 pm. and 8:00 pm., and almost *two-thirds* occurs in the nine hours between 2:00 pm. and 11:00 pm.

Quality after-school, weekend and summer programs for children and youth can cut crime dramatically—by offering school-age kids a safe haven from negative influences, and providing constructive activities that teach them not only the skills they need to succeed, but also values like responsibility, hard work, and respect and concern for others.

After-school programs and other quality youth development programs have an immediate impact on crime and negative social behavior. For example:

- One study compared juvenile arrests in a public housing project sag an after-school skills development program with those in another housing project providing only minimal recreational services. The number of juvenile arrests declined by 75 percent after the start of the after-school program, while they were increasing by 67 percent in the comparison project.
- A Public/Private Ventures study of Big Brothers/Big Sisters' carefully-designed mentoring program showed that young people randomly assigned to receive a trained mentor were only about half as likely to begin illegal drug use or to hit someone as those randomly assigned to the control group.
- Participants randomly assigned to a high school Quantum Opportunities Program of counseling, academic and life skills support, community service and financial incentives, were less than one-quarter as likely to be convicted of a crime during the high-risk high school years as those in a control group. In other words, denying kids these services *quadrupled* the likelihood that they would be convicted of a crime while in high school. *The impact on crime was virtually immediate.* Programs like Quantum Opportunities show what can happen when after-school enrichment activities are integrated with in-school help for at-risk youngsters.

After school programs are also proven to help kids develop the skills and good values—like honesty, respect, hard work and community involvement—that they need to succeed. For example, those who participated in the Quantum Opportunities Program were 50 percent more likely to graduate high school on time and two-and-a-half times more likely to attend post-secondary schooling.

Quality school-age programs have been shown to have special importance for low-income youngsters, especially those growing up in neighborhoods where "hanging out" means being exposed to widespread negative influences from peers and from older children and adults. These youngsters learn to be more cooperative, get along better with others handle conflicts better, read more, participate in more academically enriching activities, and have better grades and school conduct when they are provided quality after-school programs.

As the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development observed in its seminal report on youth development programs, "risk will be transformed into opportunity" when we provide young people with the out-of-school youth development programs that can turn "their non-school hours into the time of their lives."

LAW ENFORCEMENT LEADERS OVERWHELMINGLY SUPPORT INVESTMENTS IN KIDS

If you don't believe the studies, ask those of us who are on the front lines every day. In a Northeastern University poll, when police chiefs nation-wide were asked to rank the long-term effectiveness of a number of possible crime-lighting approaches, the chiefs picked "increasing investment in programs that help all children and youth get a good start" as the "most effective" crime-prevention strategy nearly four-to-one over "trying more juveniles as adults" or even "hiring additional police officers." And ninety-two percent of police chiefs agreed that "America could sharply reduce crime if government invested more" in after-school programs and quality child development care for preschoolers.

Police know we'll never be able to arrest and imprison our way out of the crime problem. That's why nearly 200 police chiefs, prosecutors, crime victims, and the leaders of two of America's largest police officer organizations earlier this month issued a *Call for Action,* urging Congress and state legislatures to provide enough funding to ensure that while parents are at work, all children in America get the quality child care and after-school programs proven to help them get the right start in life and stay on track through their school-age years.

That same call was adopted last week by the Major Cities Chiefs organization—representing 49 of America's largest metropolitan areas—at our winter meeting. We don't often pass resolutions. But last week we voted unanimously to call for public

policies supporting quality child care and after-school programs for all kids—policies without which we will never win our war on crime.

AFTER-SCOOL INITIATIVES IN BALTIMORE: CUTTING CRIME AND BUILDING PRIDE

I believe so strongly In the crime-prevention power of after-school programs that I've used $3 million annually from my police budget to create after-school programs. To date, we've opened 27 Police Athletic League (PAL) centers; In the end, we will have 29 centers—one in every police sector.

Baltimore's PAL centers serve kids aged 7 to 17, every school day from 2:00 pm. to 10:00 pm. Each center is staffed by 2 police officers, plus other police staff, AmeriCorps volunteers, and volunteers from the community. Each center provides not only recreation, but also academic tutoring and homework help, cultural programs, crafts, and athletics.

The neighborhood where we created our first Police Activities League center two years ago experienced a 42 percent drop in crime during the program's first year, and has experienced a significant increase in neighborhood pride. PAL kids' grade point averages have climbed to between 66 percent and 81 percent, juvenile crime and victimization have fallen dramatically, and the surrounding neighborhood has become a neighborhood of choice because of the PAL Center.

POLIY IMPLICATIONS

Baltimore's experience is both encouraging and sobering. PAL has helped reduce juvenile crime significantly. But day to day, we serve just 5,000 of the more than 105,000 kids In our city schools—because we don't have the resources to do more. Thousands of kids in Baltimore aren't getting the after-school supervision and activities they need.

Nation-wide, each day's final school bell starts more than 5 million latchkey kids on an unsupervised afternoon that too often involves crime, drugs and teen-age sex. The results are tragic and eminently avoidable.

From a crime-prevention perspective, it is critical to provide after-school services in high-crime areas. Every child in America should have access to quality programs In the before- and after-school hours, during the summer and on weekends—but priority one must be making sure that these programs reach the children who are most at-risk of criminal behavior.

Let me also emphasize my feeling—and the feeling of my colleagues in law enforcement—that increases in after-school care for school-age youth should not come at the expense of quality care for infants, toddlers and preschoolers. Investments In children during the crucial developmental years before kindergarten are also powerful weapons against crime. For example:

- A High/Scope Educational Research Foundation study in Michigan randomly admitted half the at-risk three- and four-year old applicants to its quality pre-school center, and provided their parents with in-home coaching on parenting skills. Twenty-two years later, those who had received these services as toddlers were *just one-fifth as likely* to be chronic lawbreakers as kids denied the services.
- 1In a similar study in Syracuse, at-risk kids who were provided preschool and other services were only *one-tenth as likely* as kids denied those services to be delinquent by age 16.

In other words, denying the High/Scope child care and parenting coaching services *quintupled the risk*—every American's risk—that these children would grow up to have five or more arrests. Denying the service provided in the Syracuse study multiplied by ten times our risk that they would be delinquent as young teens.

We believe it is critical that as a first step you propose funding *increases in mandatory spending* over the next live years of:

- at least an additional $10 billion for Head Start, so that the program can expand to serve more eligible children, can provide full-day and year-round care for more of the eligible children who need it, and can maintain and further strengthen its quality;
- at least an additional $5 billion for Early Head Start or other quality programs for children under three; and
- at least $20 billion for the Child Care and Development Block Grant to Increase the accessibility and quality of child care for children from families making less than 85 percent of median income, with at least 55 billion for after-school programs for school-aged youth.

These amounts, while they still fall short of meeting America's crime-prevention need would represent one of the most powerful steps Congress has taken towards closing our gaping *crime prevention deficit*—the penny-wise, pound-foolish shortfall in support of quality child care and after-school programs for kids that now endangers every American.

We also urge that tobacco tax revenues be used to provide secure funding to meet America's child care and after-school needs before they are called upon for other purposes.

As I mentioned above, the public's safety absolutely requires that quality child care and after-school programs reach not only middle-class children and youth, but also those from lower-income families who are most at-risk of being lured into criminal activity. While tax credits for working families can be valuable if they are balanced with other strategies, they are not likely to do enough by themselves to make quality child care accessible to families making less than 85 percent of median income. A plan which fails to assure that those youngsters get the right start would miss the most critical public safety need in the child care and youth development area, throwing away an anti-crime weapon we cannot afford to discard.

SUMMARY

For those of us on the front lines of the battle against crime, the once-quiet crisis in child care is now noisy, pervasive, insistent, and tragic. It screams through our police sirens rushing to yet another crime that never had to happen. It is heard In the cries of agony of thousands of crime victims and their families whose lives are needlessly lost or shattered each year. It is visible as yellow crime scene tape, body bags, and blood-stained sidewalks on the nightly news.

Everyone knows that the delivery of child care must take place not in Washington, D.C., but in our communities—through partnerships of schools, parents, businesses and community groups. But there's no more fundamental government responsibility than protecting the public safety. To live up to that obligation, the Federal Government needs to provide the funds that will enable every American community to have the after-school programs that cut crime and build better kids.

If there is one point In the discussion of child care that no American can afford to miss, it is this: If we want our own families to be safe, we all have a stake In making sure that every working family has access to quality child care and after-school programs.

Until we start investing on the "front end"—by supporting the programs that give all children the right start—we'll always be stuck on a treadmill, with more kids becoming criminals faster than we can lock them up.

Congress needs to Invest in America's most vulnerable kids today, instead of waiting to spend much more later—I money and in lives—on those who become "America's Most Wanted" adults.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. That was very compelling testimony from all of you. That is why we are here today, and that is why I had that little confrontation at the beginning of the hearing. We all have competing needs, but we cannot ignore the critical importance of the activities that you are discussing here in the total picture. We need to be able to find different ways to learn from experience, in order to be successful.

As I mentioned before, I think all of us on the committee would agree that encouraging collaborative efforts among schools, businesses, law enforcement and service agencies is an ideal way of doing business. However, once a school-age program has found a home base, equipment, activities and dedicated staff, there are still a number of crucial areas that need to be addressed. Those areas begin with issues of basic health and safety for students and move toward perhaps accreditation and credentialing for interested parties and providers.

How do programs go about ensuring that their programs meet these sorts of basic licensing requirements?

Ms. CHILDEARS. I would say that each of the organizations that is a member of the National Assembly is a national organization in its own right. They have standards that they have developed for their programs, and they also participate in any national accrediting that pertains to the particular thing they are doing. For instance, camping—there are organizations that look at camping standards on a national level. So I think our organizations are very

attentive to the standards that have been established through long-term processes.

Mr. SHENINGER. Senator, in our State, the agencies that house or maintain our programs are required to meet State standards for child care facilities. They come in and look at the facilities, they have to have fire inspections, there are square footage requirements. So they are already under guidelines, and they happen to be the State guidelines.

Mr. FRAZIER. Similarly, we are in governmental facilities that are very closely inspected. Our traditional partners are Boy Scouts, Boys and Girls Club, Camp Fire, YMCA. Just let me say very quickly that the reason for that is we all believe—"Police Athletic League" is a misnomer; we spend about 20 percent of our money on athletics—it is really education, arts and culture, character development, and athletics, all of the very same issues, structure and guidance and values. Frankly, athletics is the frosting on the cake; that is the hook to get the kids in the door. It is far more education, arts and culture, character development, and the programs are very much collaborative, and I think the standards are well-known and well-researched.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you identify some barriers that could be removed to make it easier for you to accomplish the goals of accreditation?

Mr. FRAZIER. Accreditation is not really our issue in terms of barriers. I think it is the seven issues of getting your programs up and running, transportation, nutrition and start-up. In my particular situation, for instance, the officers are very thoroughly backgrounded, and they are re-polygraphed and backgrounded again before they go into a Police Athletic League, and there is a very structured course of training that is done by a recreation professional before they are actually put into the Police Athletic League centers.

Accreditation—I think those processes are fairly well-established.

Mr. SHENINGER. Senator, I would say the agencies that are responsible for establishing the programs often are involved with child care and other types of situations as well. I know that Catholic Charities works with individual parents and trains them, and then they become certified as child care providers. So they are pretty much aware of the requirements before they get into the programs.

I do not recall any particular barriers they have had from that angle in instituting programs in our areas.

Ms. CHILDEARS. I would agree with that, except that sometimes the resources to achieve requirements at a particular location can be a burden, but achieving them and understanding them, I think we clearly know what they are.

The CHAIRMAN. We are hearing a lot about the actual process involved in setting up successful programs, and we have talked a little bit about that. Mr. Sheninger, in your testimony, you talked about the importance of teachers, and you said that "In designing the program, it is important to decide who is best to administer it. It may or may not be the school, and that decision should rest with the principal." Could you elaborate on that?

Mr. SHENINGER. Surely. When I first became interested in child care, seeing the necessity for it as an educator, that we are concerned about what happens to our children after they leave our buildings, I did not feel that I had the expertise in after-school child care. I did not have it, and quite honestly, I did not have the time to set up a program myself or to monitor that program.

We were also trying to see if we could provide the service without a financial cost to our taxpayers. We were able to pair with an agency, Catholic Charities, that had knowledge of child care, expertise, and we could do it in a situation that would not cost us any money. So from that perspective, they knew what they were doing, they were the experts on child care.

The process we went through was not really complicated at all. Our board of education is very supportive of a number of issues, and they really care about kids, and they are looking to do things for kids beyond just the typical educational things. So they were very accepting of the idea when we put it forth to them.

We started in one school, we expanded to another; it became a model for our county, and they have included eight or nine other sites since that time. And we went into the summer program the same way. As long as it could be done in a way that was manageable—they handle all the financial questions, they handle the hiring and personnel questions. I work with them, and I am the liaison on site, so any problems that come up go through me and the person who is responsible for the particular program. It has worked very, very well.

The CHAIRMAN. Ms. Childears, do you have any comment?

Ms. CHILDEARS. I think it is a very difficult decision, because someone has got to be accountable for that building, and I think that that is probably the principal. What we would like to see is some sort of incentive to an individual school or school district to really work with community-based organizations. We are not asking the principals to give up the accountability they have for the site, but something to really incent them to work more with community-based organizations.

You have heard a couple of examples today of wonderful scenarios in a couple of communities that work beautifully, but that is not what we hear across the country from the members of our organization. So we are really looking for a way to encourage more schools to look at it like the ones we are hearing about today.

The CHAIRMAN. Commissioner Frazier?

Mr. FRAZIER. Honestly, school-based programs have been very difficult for us to be successful in. We have brought together in our city a group called Safe and Sound—the 501(c)(3) is the Baltimore Community Foundation, but the school district, the health department, the housing department, the police department, recreation, Johns Hopkins, University of Maryland, the YMCA, Boys and Girls Clubs—everyone is in one large collaborative which distributes a Robert Woods Johnson grant-funded operation that will be the pass-through for a number of grant opportunities.

I think it is most helpful to have the ability for a local collaboration of that nature to be a grant recipient and then, at the local level, if I have a good partnership at Mildred Monroe School, I will apply to the local foundation as a partner with Mildred Monroe,

but I may also have another one at Moore Crossman with the Recreation Department, and at Druid Hill with the YMCA. I think it is another way to look at how to create a funding stream so that it is most valuable. And when it gets right down to it, at the local level, you may have a school district that says, "Sorry, too much liability; you cannot use our facility." I happen to think that you are right that in most cases, that is an excuse. But there are various levels of partnership and sincerity, I think, among the various players, and at the local level, we know who the A-teamers are, and we know who we want to partner with, and we know who the effective collaborations are with, and I, frankly, am looking for good partners, and I will go with the strongest team that I can in the neighborhoods where I can make the most difference. We are really about being successful.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you go about working on a collaboration? Do you sit down and discuss it with someone who knows the neighborhood and figure out who is the one to approach first? How do you work it out?

Mr. FRAZIER. In the Safe and Sound collaboration that I spoke of earlier, there has been a good deal of process. There were dozens and dozens of community forums, youth forums. All the kids voted on a dozen of the most important things to them in terms of viability as they grew up, and they included safety, job opportunity training, arts and culture. There were a number of things that became very clear to us that, as a city, we needed to provide.

Then it is bringing the right service providers together in the right proportion and in the right location for the right age group of kids, open the right hours of the day, to deliver the tailored kind of services that your local community processes bubble up as to what the community need is.

I thought it was very interesting that Brad said the local police department had become friends with the kids. In this socioeconomic model that I described, one of the fears is that as our youngsters grow up, they will not see their police department as part of the social fabric of their city. That is why, in a community policing model, you see the chiefs—and the big city police chiefs just a week ago, from Phoenix and Houston, are doing exactly the same thing as I am and have very much the same sense that we really do want our youngsters to see us at the table as being part of the solution to provide safe spaces and positive alternatives and good role models for them as they grow up to be our adult citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. Any other comments?

[No response.]

The CHAIRMAN. There must be a tendency when you try to work out these collaborations that the easiest place to put them is where you need them least, and the hardest place to get collaboration is where you need it most. Is that generally true?

Mr. FRAZIER. No. Particularly in our case, take a Police Athletic Center, for instance. There are two police officers and a community service officer there. If we had, say, 60 choices last year of where we should go, the secure areas where we have strong neighborhood associations, high owner-occupancy, good parent-teacher organizations are not where I am looking to go. I am looking to go to the places where the rec centers were closed because there were

shootings there, where staff in no other organization will dream of working nights.

I think part of the local ability is to be able to tailor your resources, because there are certain places where frankly, only the police department can run a program for teenage kids from, say, 4 to 12—it is just not possible for anyone else to do it. That is where we should be. There are plenty of other neighborhoods where very, very good collaborations are possible, and we certainly are circumspect about who goes where.

I have about $3 million worth of officers a year doing strict prevention work. That is Police Athletic League, and that comes out of my existing budget. That is about a 1.5 percent commitment to prevention, which I do not think is excessive by any stretch, but I have a PAL center in every police sector. There are nine precincts, each with three sectors, and they have a center per sector. That gives me good geographic equidistancing, but we are certainly going into neighborhoods where we can use that PAL center as an institutional anchor for the bigger process of community organization and development. We intentionally go where we need to be the most.

The CHAIRMAN. Other comments?

Ms. CHILDEARS. I would just say that every local community knows what its need is, and every local community knows who can make it happen. The beauty of community-based decisions and collaboration is that you get the right folks together, and it happens where it needs to happen. And those partners are probably going to be different in every, single community.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you check to see whether you are being successful? What kind of records do you keep, and how do you measure your success?

Mr. FRAZIER. It is an eternal dilemma. There are some very subjective measures, and there are some very objective measures. We very definitely track school attendance, we track grade-point average. We certainly know how many criminal justice contacts these kids have with our department. We have a centralized juvenile intake facility, so it is a very easy cross-check to make.

Int he center that has been there the longest, where we have been able to track academics, I think I mentioned before that the grade-point went from 66 to 81. I think the subjective things are more anecdotal—parents who will stand up in a community meeting and say that they prayed for someone to intervene with their children, to get them on the right track. There is one young man—and I would be happy to send you the article—who was involved in a couple of auto thefts, had been hanging around on the corner and was beginning to get into the drug trade. He came into a center and a particular officer took him under his wing, and his mother will stand in front of any group and say that without this, Darrell would be a different young man today than he would have been otherwise.

I think there really are some objective ways to track is. Certainly, the crime rate in the neighborhood is a good one. In the particular area of the center I just spoke of, the fact that it has become a neighborhood of choice, the average length of tenancy is much longer, the occupancy rate is from 86 to 96 percent. It really does

become a neighborhood where there is a good deal of pride in ownership and commitment, and it really is a neighborhood of choice. And that is really the whole community policing model of trying to get your neighborhoods involved, and then you have more parent volunteers, and instead of a negative cycle, it turns into a positive cycle.

We are in the process now of applying with Johns Hopkins to the National Institutes of Health for a more longitudinal study. I think everybody has trouble with that. But certainly, all of the short-term, objective research that we can do and the anecdotal feedback that I get says we are very much on the right track. We need to do it for boys and girls to 17; we need to do it at night from 2 to 10 p.m.; we need to do education, arts and culture, character development. The athletics, the karate classes, the dance classes—that is the fun stuff you get to do after you have done your homework, and we have checked to make sure that you are going to school and you are serious about your grades.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes?

Mr. SHENINGER. Senator, at our level, I think one indicator of success is participation. We started with approximately 14 children at one site, and our school currently has approximately 50 children on our rolls. We have opened the other elementary school because of the need, and now they have a program in their school as well, and that has spread throughout the country.

So I think that if you have people participating, it is a good indicator that the program is working.

I wanted to mention one thing regarding what Ms. Childears said, which I think is very important, and that is that each situation has to be looked at uniquely. What I can do in my school, a principal in a neighboring school may not be able to do; he may not have the available space to do a program. He can still be an active participant, but it may not be in his particular building. I think it is critical that we have to take a look at each situation and see how each partner can contribute.

Ms. CHILDEARS. In our organizations, the issue of accountability is clearly there all the time with our funders and so on, and many of these organizations are approaching 100 years old. And we would be happy to provide with you information from any of those organizations about how they measure accountability.

There are three fairly high-profile studies recently that come to mind. One is the public-private ventures which worked primarily with Big Brothers and Big Sisters. They took a look at how mentoring works and the relationships, and there is clear documentation there that there is a positive impact.

Boys and Girls Clubs were involved in another high-profile study called Smart Moves that was conducted in housing projects to see what kind of impact could be made with their programmatic efforts. Delinquency was down, school grades improved, and there were a number of very distinct measures.

And the study that I know you were involved with, the Carnegie Study, "A Matter of Time," talks a lot about productive use of after-school time and kids being involved in good alternatives.

So we feel that we have a number of ways that we can point to the components that have been in all the programs for years.

The CHAIRMAN. I cannot tell you how important it is for you to develop ways to really measure success. The problem we have here, especially with a shortage of resources, is how do you say this program should get more money or less money, or should it be funded at all. My investigation into trying to find out results has been very dismal. I think we had 160 training programs going, and I asked how many had any longitudinal evaluation, and I think there were two, and one of them was for 6 months, and one was for a little longer, to determine whether the people who got trained stayed in their jobs.

I want to emphasize that we have got to find ways to better determine if programs that we know feel good, or look good on paper really are good. Hopefully, we can develop those evaluation mechanisms.

Well, thank you all. This has been very rewarding and very helpful testimony. We have had an interesting day. I hope you have enjoyed it in a meaningful fashion as I have.

[Additional statements and material submitted for the record follow:]

Testimony Submitted for the Record

"The Non-School Hours: Mobilizing School and Community Resources"

Committee on Labor and Human Resources
Full Committee Hearing
Wednesday, February 25, 1998
9:30 am SD-430

Volunteers of America
National Office

Childcare Statement
Labor and Human Resources Committee
United States Senate
February 25, 1998

Volunteers of America is pleased to offer this statement on childcare that we hope will be useful in the development of a forward-looking policy for the nation.

It is often said that our children are our future. As in anything as important as "our future" as a nation, it should be expected that adequate investment in time, energy, and resources be made to assure the success of that future. If the United States is to build toward its future with a civil society and a competent workforce that meets or exceeds global expectations, it is necessary that the most valuable investment would be in the care and nurturing of our children—the greatest potential resource we or any country has.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Childcare has been a part of our continuing legacy of service, having provided day care for working mothers since before the turn of the century. After 102 years, Volunteers of America continues to provide childcare for over 3,200 children across the country, along with gang prevention, mentoring, preschool programs, parent and grandparent education, Head Start, childcare provider training, and services to abused and neglected children, among other child and youth services. Our approach to this vital subject, therefore, is based on a century of experience in working with children and youth and their families.

Even with the resources already available, our federal and state governments fall far short in their investment in developmentally appropriate childcare, youth development, parenting education and support systems, and productive after-school programs for children of all ages. Statistics on the prevalence of latchkey children, child abuse and neglect, youth delinquency and gang activity all bear this out.

To be sure, parents must shoulder the major responsibility for the upbringing of their children. However, when a single parent, surrogate parent, or both in-home parents must or choose to work outside the home, Volunteers of America believes that federal policy should, in the national interest, assure that all families have access to affordable, high quality, developmentally appropriate child and after-school care. In addition to the fiscal resources necessary to carry out this policy, Volunteers of America also believes it is the right, responsibility, and obligation of the federal government to the nation's children to establish and maintain minimum national standards for childcare, such as those used in Head Start or promulgated by the National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Attainment of the following principles should be the goal of new federal legislation:

- Quality, affordable, 24-hour childcare for all infants, toddlers, and preschool children in a safe, healthy environment, whether center-based or home-based
- Access to positive, productive after-school, after-hour, weekend, and summer programs for all school-aged children and teens
- Developmentally appropriate practices based on the latest research on the cognitive and emotional development of children and youth
- Parent involvement and parent support networks to train and assist them in their most important role of being parents
- A career development system to provide appropriately trained and reasonably paid childcare and youth workers to carry out this work
- A support network for family and in-home childcare givers to provide training, information, and backup resources, and
- A low child-to-staff ratio supported by subsidy payments, where necessary, that reflect the absolute cost of care.

To achieve such far-reaching national policy requires that it be backed by sufficient resources to help states, communities, and providers accomplish it. Declining federal support for the Social Services Block Grant, which has provided a major source of state funds for childcare, is currently undermining that capability.

Also, while federal policy should establish the standards to which all states, localities, and providers would rise and be held accountable, program specifics to achieve those standards should be community-based and community-directed involving parents; schools; community-based organizations and providers; appropriate child welfare, social service, and recreation agencies; police and the justice system; religious organizations; businesses; other appropriate individuals and institutions; and the children and youths themselves. Such partnerships are the are at the core of today's innovative federalism.

Finally, no statement on the need for an improved national program of childcare and after-school youth programs would be complete without reminding ourselves of the fact that, in this day and age, two-thirds of American women with children under six now work outside the home. That situation for families with either or both preschool and in school children is made all the larger by the growing number of mostly single mothers now entering the workforce from the welfare system.

In 1991, the Committee for Economic Development, comprised of executives of some of the nation's largest companies, issued a report calling for "a new vision for childcare and education" in the United States. In it they stated, "The lack of availability of quality child care that is developmentally appropriate, has educational value, and is affordable has created a crisis of national proportions that affects most families but hits low-income families the hardest."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

While it is the mission of the Volunteers of America to serve those most in need, it is the constitutional obligation of the federal government to provide for the well being of all the people, including children. The time has come for this to be done.

Volunteers of America thanks the committee for beginning this legislative work and pledges our assistance in the development of a childcare and after-school system the families and young people of America deserve.

For further information contact Ron Field, vice president for public policy, Volunteers of America National Office, 110 S. Union Street, Alexandria VA 22314-3324, (703) 548-2288, fax (703) 684-1972, e-mail rfield@voa.org.

1998 NSACA PUBLIC POLICY POSITION PAPER

Quality School-Age Care

A Public Investment that Pays Triple Dividends

YOUTH DEVELOPMENT

WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

nsaca
The National School-Age Care Alliance
1137 Washington Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02124
Tel (617)298-5012 • Fax (617)298-5022 • Email staff@nsaca.org • Web www.nsaca.org

[redacted]

Approximately 24 million school-age children between the ages of five and fourteen require care while their parents are at work.[1] Quality care for these children is an investment that pays triple dividends: youth development, workforce development, and delinquency prevention.

As working parents can attest, their child care concerns are not over once their children are old enough to go to school. Studies report many working parents suffer from the "3 o'clock syndrome" – at this time, productivity decreases because they are worried about their children who are no longer at school.[2] A parent who employed full time can be away from home an average of 2400 hours a year. Children spend less than half (1200 hours) of that time in school. If their children participate in a quality school-age care program or another organized out-of-school time activity, parents can rest easy because they know that their children are safe and supervised.

But not all parents enroll their school-age children in quality care. Experts estimate that nearly five million school-age children spend time without adult supervision during a typical week. Exact figures are not available due to parents' reluctance to report leaving children alone.[3] Some estimates of "latchkey kids" are as high as 15 million.[4] Many 10-14 year-olds are taking care of younger siblings in low-income families.

[redacted]

The problems and temptations children face when they are left unsupervised are alarming. Studies indicate that these children:

- have higher absentee rates at school
- have lower academic test scores
- exhibit higher levels of fear, stress, nightmares, loneliness and boredom
- are 1.7 times more likely to use alcohol, and
- are 1.6 times more likely to smoke cigarettes.[5]

Another study indicates that after-school hours -- between 3 and 6 p.m. -- are the most common time for sexual intercourse among children and youth.[6] These hours are also when the greatest percentage of property crimes are committed by children.[7]

[redacted]

Afternoons, school vacations, and summer leave large blocks of time that are ideal for learning, exploring, and developing new skills. Quality school-age care programs offer tremendous opportunities to provide these experiences.

---

[1] National Institute on Out-of-School Time, *Fact Sheet on School-Age Care, 1997*
[2] *Work and Family Newsletter*, July 1993
[3] National Institute on Out-of-School Time, op. cit.
[4] Cherry D. Hayes, et al., *What Cares for America's Children*, National Research Council, National Academy Press, 1990
[5] *Home Alone: What are the Dangers?* School's Out Consortium, Seattle, 1995
[6] Ibid
[7] *School-age Child Care: Links to Quality Education and Early Intervention for At-Risk Youth*, Campaign for Working Families, 1994

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

School-age care programs provide supervision, guidance, and activities for children and youth ages five to fourteen in their out-of-school time. The programs operate in urban, rural, and suburban communities, centers, churches, YMCA's, YWCA's, Cooperative Extension Services, libraries, community colleges, and other not-for-profit agencies and child care centers.

High quality school-age programs are an ideal prevention/intervention tool because they provide children and youth with a place where they can "hang out" in a safe environment, as well as the opportunity to develop skills. According to the 1994 study "Preventing Problem Behaviors and Raising Academic Performance in the Nation's Youth," children who participate in school-age care programs:

- are more cooperative with adults;
- are more likely to resolve conflicts by talking instead of hitting or fighting;
- improve their academic performance
- and in many instances, avoid being retained in a grade. This created a savings of over one million dollars for the school districts studied.[1]

As the Children's Defense Fund reports, the developmental and enrichment opportunities that these programs provide are especially important today given the highly competitive working world that young people will be entering in just a few years. "With more employers requiring solid basic skills, a high school diploma, and often college experience as prerequisites to job entry, more young people -- especially poor and minority youth -- need academic help and encouragement, help that can be provided after school as well as during school."[2]

What is quality school age child care?

While there is certainly a need for more programs, high quality is key to a full return on investment in school-age care. Research has shown that key components necessary for a quality school-age program are:

- A trained staff, skilled in the activities that school-age children enjoy;
- A safe space that meets the physical, emotional and social needs of children and youth
- A wide variety of materials appropriate to the ages and developmental levels of the children;
- Family involvement in the program;
- Opportunities for children to choose activities and pursue their interests;
- Curriculum and staff which reflects the racial and cultural heritage of the children and which promotes diversity;
- A climate characterized by positive interaction of staff with children.[3]

The biggest programmatic focus of NSACA as an organization for the past two years has been the development of a national program improvement and accreditation system. This is a national initiative to systematically improve the quality of school-age care. In collaboration with the National Institute on Out-of School Time, NSACA has developed a set of national standards for programs. These standards will provide a framework for community collaborations involving families, schools, businesses, policy makers and providers to ensure that quality programs are available to children, youth and families.

---

[1] *Preventing Problem Behaviors and Raising Academic Performance in the Nations' Children: The Impact of 21st School Age Child Care Programs Supported by the Cooperative Extension Service*, Riley, Steinberg, Todd, Junge, MacLean, 1994

[2] *Opportunities for Prevention: Building After-School and Summer Programs for Young Adolescents*, Children's Defense Fund, Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Clearing House, July 1987

[3] *Washington State's Role in Building an Effective School-age Care System*, Clegg and Assoc, December 1993.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[illegible]:

In the child care industry, affordability, staff wages and quality are all interrelated. Parents fees account for over 80% of program budgets. Ten percent is from government funds and the rest from miscellaneous sources, in the form of parent subsidies.[1]

Since providers know they cannot charge parents much more than they already do, they keep staff wages low. Staff wages take over 60% of a program's budget. Nationally, entry-level staff are paid about $6 per hour, with senior staff receiving about $7 per hour. Directors make only slightly more, about $7.75 per hour. According to the 1989 National Child Care Staffing Study, low wages are the major cause of the high staff turnover rates in school-age programs, which in turn is believed to lower the quality of care provided.[2]

The only federal funding specifically targeted to support school-age care programs in the past was the Federal Dependent Care Block Grant. In 1997, Congress allocated 19.1 million in the new Child Care Development Funds targeted for school-age care and resource and referral programs. This funding runs through September 30, 1999.

After years of little federal funding there is now an increase in public attention and interest in school-age care as both a crime prevention strategy and a way to improve academic achievement. The President and many legislators are now recommending increased funding for school-age programs and after-school activities. The time is now for a dramatic increase in federal funding for school-age care through work of legislators, advocates, policy makers, parents and providers.

Action Needed:

Get the word out to national and state legislators.
Any child care initiative must support quality school-age care and include:

- Funding for structured activities for children and youth five to fourteen in their out-of school time across all communities
- Fee subsidies for year-round programming that meets the needs of working parents for care before and after school and during the summer
- Support for a variety of programs including community based youth serving organizations, schools, municipalities and private providers
- Means to address improvements in the quality of care including program standards, accreditation
- Support for increased staff compensation linked to training

For more information, please contact:

Or NSACA Public Policy Co-chairs: Linda Zang, (410) 787-7813, or Janet Frisenig (206) 461-3602

The NSACA Public Policy Committee gratefully acknowledges the School's Out Consortium of the Seattle YWCA, the Seattle MOST Initiative, and The National Institute on Out-of-School Time for providing background information for this paper.

[1] *Making the MOST of Out-of-School Time Background Report*, Seattle MOST Project Staffing Group, December, 1994

[2] *Washington State's Role in Building an Effective School-age Care System*, Clegg and Assoc. December 1993.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you all very much. The hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:14 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

○

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ISBN 0-16-056576-6